

A DEFENCE,

BY

J. K. L.

OF HIS

VINDICATION

OF THE

RELIGIOUS AND CIVIL PRINCIPLES

OF THE

IRISH CATHOLICS.

“ Audivimus superbiam Moab : Superbus est valde ; Superbia ejus,
“ et arrogantia ejus, et indignatio ejus, plus quam fortitudo ejus.”

Isa. ch. 16.

“ Filios enutrivimus et exaltavi, ipsi vero spernaverunt me.”—Id. c. 1.

DUBLIN : PRINTED
BY RICHARD COYNE,

4, CAPEL-STREET,

Bookseller, Printer and Publisher

TO THE ROYAL COLLEGE OF ST. PATRICK, MAYNOOTH,

And published in London by

KEATING, BROWN, AND KEATING,

DUKE-STREET, GROSVENOR-SQUARE.

1824.

A. D. M. R. C. M.

A. R. A.

NOTIFICATION

RECEIVED BY THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

THE SECRETARY

THIRTEEN

THE SECRETARY

THE SECRETARY

A DEFENCE,

§c. §c. §c.

THE letter, which I had the honor of addressing to his Excellency the Marquis Wellesley, has produced a considerable sensation; a sensation, however, which has already abated, and will gradually subside, like every other which has its cause in the sensibility of the Irish character; but the impression produced by it on the public mind and common sense of the country, is not likely to be so transient or temporary. Strange as it will undoubtedly appear to some, it is for the purpose of confirming that impression that I now presume to address, not his Excellency, whom I would not trouble with the perusal of many things which I may be induced to notice, but the public, who are often indulgent even to the most importunate.

As to the personal abuse which has been profusely lavished upon myself, I submit to it, if not cheerfully, at least with resignation; and if, *en passant*, I should drop a line of exculpation or complaint, I engage it to be short. When I undertook to vindicate the principles of the Irish Catholics, I did not suppose that I could labour to stem the torrent of abuse, which threatened to overwhelm them, without affording, to the captious and malevolent, new subjects of obloquy—new topics for vituperative declamation; but, as no reasonable man courts detraction, yet should it follow on the discharge of his duty, he opposes himself to it, “as a pillar of iron, or a wall of brass.” On this principle

it was that I felt regardless of every personal inconvenience which might result from the publication of my thoughts, provided I could but merit the attention of the Most Noble the Chief Governor of Ireland, and direct the minds of those who are deeply interested in her welfare, to the contemplation of her present wants and sufferings, as well of the sources from which they spring. I could have suppressed or disguised those sentiments, in my letter, which were most likely to provoke the hostility of faction, and whilst I touched its core, I was fully sensible of the aphorism of the poet, "*incedo per ignes suppositos cineri doloso.*" But their hostility had already been pushed to an extreme; the late exposure of them in Parliament had only rendered their hate more unrelenting, and it became necessary to exhibit them in their true position, before they could succeed in merging themselves in the Protestant community, and poisoning the source of public virtue and national redemption.

The teeth of Cadmus did not encrease and multiply in greater numbers or with more rapidity than the subjects discussed in my letter. But of this numerous progeny some came prematurely into life, and others died when they had scarcely seen the light; I cast on many of them a look of pity, and then consigned them to their mother earth. I doubt whether the "OBSERVATIONS,"* which I have taken as a kind of text, has more of virtue or less of violence than those others which I have rejected, but they suit my purpose better—as being enlarged, and countenanced as I am told, by men of station. Their introduction is of course, that I am dull and stupid, a knave or fool, or both, prone to excite rebellion, and overthrow the Church, not the Church established, but that with which I claim connection. The very motto of the writer implies this, "*altera,*" he says, "*jam territur bellis civilibus ætas, suis et ipsa Roma*" "*viribus ruit.*" But J. K. L. has more than once experienced

* Declan's pamphlet is reviewed in the latter part of the "Defence."

the disasters consequent on civil wars, and though no tie of conscience bound him to the state, sufferings that are past would dictate to him "*ne te civilibus inserere bellis*;" and as to Rome whose religion he professes, he feels no misgivings on her account, and were he prone to idle conjectures, he might say of another Church "*mutato nomine de te fabula narratur*."

A quotation from history, without a reference, is adduced to prove my misrepresentations, and an enumeration is made, I doubt not, from the late Sir Richard Musgrave, of the many acts or projects of James the Second when in this country hostile to the Protestants, and subversive of their rights. These are advanced by this writer as a justification of those laws, subsequently enacted against the Catholics, of which, in my letter, I complained.

The rapid sketch which I drew of the misfortunes of this ill-fated land, comprehended several reigns; and even if the measures of retaliation, to which I am referred, were excusable, the position laid down by me would not thereby be affected, as the period to which the justification put forward by this writer extends, embraces only the reigns of Anne and the two first Georges. But, as our opponents are always disconcerted by references to the history of the penal laws, of which history they would wish us to be ignorant, as well as insensible to their effects, we shall leave their merits to be judged of, by all impartial men, who are acquainted with them. *They* will determine who were guilty of violating, by statute the most sacred rights of nature, as also whether treason on the part of Catholics leaguings with Popes and Princes, or the cupidity of the triumphant party annulled a solemn treaty. Nor should the Papal interference be objected to us, unless Cromwell's title was preferable to that of James, in which case, Ormonde, Clanricarde, and those who have hitherto been deemed most loyal and deserving subjects, should share our guilt; for since their time, the Papal power never existed here. In England, it was extinguished long

before, where the loyalty of the Catholics, and their disregard of the Papal censure against Elizabeth, are as well attested as the destruction of the Armada. This Papal power, therefore, which he confesses to be now a cypher, was so in these realms two hundred years ago, though its name still serves a party, when they wish to array the passions on their side.

This writer passes a high encomium on those Protestants who became the advocates of the Catholics in those latter times, and in which most heartily we all concur. But if gratitude on the part of their clients, could be any compensation for their efforts, never were advocates more amply repaid; for our Nobility, our Gentry, our Clergy, the children at the breast, and the old men, when descending to the grave, bless the memories of those great and virtuous sages, who looked on our wrongs and privations as their own—who devoted their labours, and sacrificed their interests to obtain their removal or redress. They redeemed, many them, the injuries done to us by their own ancestors, and made us love the posterity of those who forged our chains. “They contended,” continues this writer, “against the then unnecessary severity of the penal laws, with a degree of energy, perseverance, and effect, never equalled by the exertions of the most liberal Roman Catholics in Popish countries, against the most severe, the most protracted, and the most iniquitous persecutions.” I am not the apologist of Catholic States; but this writer should advert, that at the period when those men appeared in Ireland, the Catholic Governments, to whom any considerable number of Protestants were subject, either forfeited their allegiance, like Philip the Second, or abolished in their favour every penal law—every odious restriction without being impelled thereto by a Fox or a Grattan. It should also be observed, that the forms of our Constitution call forth such men as those now mentioned, and produce such exertions as have been described, whilst in other countries,

the same facilities are not afforded to plead before the nation the cause of the oppressed. But even before the principles of religious liberty were rightly understood, or acted upon in Europe or America, do we not find Catholic Princes, such as Philip the Fifth, Ferdinand, Leopold, and Henry the Fourth, making concessions to the Protestants of France, and the Empire, which nearly amounted to perfect freedom? and, though such concessions may have been extorted from them, by some pressing necessity or obvious advantage, do we find that either they or their successors ever violated their treaties, or took advantage of the weak and defenceless state of their subjects, to enact against them an inhuman code—a code exhibiting to the world a series of broken faith, of cruel and perfidious conduct, such as the History or Annals of Tacitus do not record? Do we reproach the posterity of those men, who governed this country in the names of William and Anne, and the two first Georges, with the laws which were then enacted? No! we recognize amongst them, many of the most virtuous and zealous of our advocates, who have more than redeemed the sins committed by their fathers, against an unoffending people; but are we to be upbraided for not forgetting what our nature and our interest oblige us to forgive? Is it because some unprincipled Irishman, who casts away his religion for base lucre, and changes or conceals his name, lest the publication of it would proclaim his infamy—is it because such a one is dead to every feeling of honour, and conducted through life only by sordid views, that the high-minded Catholics, who have never broken faith with God or men, should be branded with imputations of disloyalty? Search their history for two hundred years, and adduce almost a single instance of disaffection, on the part of the Catholic Gentry or Clergy. Search the records for their oaths, and discover where they were violated? View the Government; whether embarrassed or secure, whether it smiled or frowned, has it not always been sustained by the

loyalty of the Catholics? And when insurrection or rebellion devastated the provinces, or threatened the capital, have not the Minister and the Patriot united, to proclaim in Parliament and before the throne, that the allegiance of the Catholics, as such, remained steady and unbroken? But the Apostates, from their own race, speaking from the fullness of *their hearts*, defame them; and the Church and the Orangemen, trembling for their monopoly, assail them with the arrows of slander and calumny. Lewis the Fourteenth revoked the edict of Nantz. His example can be quoted by those who violated the treaty of Limerick; but, if subjects leaguings with foreign powers, against their lawful Sovereign, could justify so cruel a proceeding, his name would not have come down to us, as that of a Monarch who even by that act injured as much the real interests of France, as he enhanced, by other deeds, her power and her glory. Yet his cruelty to the Huguenots was of but short duration; for the French, though fickle, have too much love of country, to compromise her interests by disputing about creeds!

But we are accused of ingratitude, for having said, that “the extravagance of the dominant race, the lights of the last century, and the humanity of the late King, mitigated the evils we endured.” This writer should not charge me with ingratitude, for the good influence I attribute to our late excellent King—nor can he be displeased with the reference I make to the lights of the last century, inasmuch those lights were propagated by that host of patriots and philosophers whom we have just applauded—“men of great power, and endued with wisdom, and by the strength of wisdom instructing the people—men rich in virtue, studying beautifulness, living at peace in their houses, all of whom have gained glory in their generations, and were praised in their days—men of mercy, whose godly deeds have not failed.” *Ecc. xlv.* No! his exception is not taken to the portion of good attributed to the virtuous few, but to what is called “the ex-

“travagance of the dominant race.” Well, then! is this writer not sufficiently versed in the history of those times to know, that when Catholics were first permitted to take leases for 999 years, one of the principal objects with the “Contractors,” (a name understood by all versed in Irish history,) was to enable their vassals, (for I shall not call them slaves,) who had amassed large sums of money, and were daily transmitting it to the Continent, to purchase or take mortgages on lands at home; and was not the statute, which required a rack-rent to be reserved, and the term of years to be limited to 21 when lands were let to Papists, proved at that time to be an insuperable bar to the improvement of the country—as prejudicial to the landlord as to the tenant? And when the elective franchise was afterwards conceded, had it not been admitted, that the system of importing Protestant freeholders from Germany could not be successful—that Catholic serfs might be brought as tamely, and with less expense, to the hustings than freemen, and would be a much more productive species of husbandmen for the lordly Commoner or contracting Peer? I passed by in my letter all mention of the difficulties in which the state itself was placed at the close of the American war, and when France and Spain were truly formidable, because I did not wish to detract from the humanity of the King; and, if I barely allude to them at present, it is because I am charged with ingratitude, in a case where I did not withhold the expression of it from those to whom we were truly indebted.

The decided opinion of this writer is, “that the Prelates and the Agitators of the Roman Catholics would be seriously grieved, if the remaining remnant of the penal code was repealed.” He will allow me to disclaim the name of Agitator, and to assure him I am not at all ambitious of that of Patriot, though I think with Doctor Laurence, that even a Priest, has civil duties to fulfil; and that if, in the discharge of religious and civil duties conjoined, he

can succeed in stating the case of his country, he should not shrink from any imputations, which it may please the enemies of her happiness to cast upon her advocate ; especially if he can reckon amongst the companions of his fortune such men for instance, as those Catholics who in Dublin voted an address to the King at the conclusion of the last Session of Parliament. As to the other part of the silly opinion quoted above, there is this advantage in it, that it acquits the Catholic Prelates of those ambitious views, which a certain class of their opponents have not ceased to impute to them; and may, if adopted by the influential persons of the hostile party, induce them to labour for the abolition of the penal code, with a view of disappointing men who seem to be the objects of their peculiar hate.

To the sex whom Doctor Doyle is supposed to have offended, J. K. L. on his part offers the most submissive apology : he feared their panegyrist was about saying to him from the fable, “ Sour Grapes,” or something so harsh on their part as would oblige him to exclaim “ *tantæne animis celestibus iræ*”—but no ! all is charity ; “ charity “ which bears all, suffers all, and seeketh not for self,” and this the more prodigious when it is ready to be exercised towards an unhappy mortal, who in his rage, as the writer, “ verily believes,” would call bears out of the woods to devour those ladies,—their husbands and children, and all who are of their communion, for laughing at the miracles !” I have never, I trust laughed at any thing sacred, and though I have frequently laughed for the last three months at what I saw written on the subject of miracles, from “ Miracles mooted,” to the “ Complete Exposure,” I feared too much the woe denounced by the Lord against the scoffers, to laugh at the miracles themselves. But however I might have laughed or sighed, for I sometimes indulge in either, I am quite certain I never wished evil to any child of Adam, nor precipitated my judgment so as to impute even to the worst of the admirers of the

works of Joshua, half the cruelty which they imputed or appropriated to themselves. Still less did I feel resentment against those few (and very few they were) who laughed at the miracles, and if I became *mad*, as my correspondent supposes, I have only to hope that, like Hamlet, there was method in my madness.

This Gentleman supposes that I ask for a serious discussion on the subject now noticed, and undertakes to give it to me. I did not indeed ask him for it, and yet feel great pleasure in having to add his lucubrations to those others against many of which I was tempted sometimes to utter the imprecation of Swift upon "the Legion Club," or to say with that Cynic Poet, on casting them from me.

"To convince you I will never
"By disputing once endeavour."

Of these lucubrations however some are interesting for the science, the ingenuity, the taste, the eloquence, the piety or enthusiasm, which they display ;* but the greater part are coarse and vulgar, nauseous and unclean, filled with ribaldry and irreligion.

It is stated in one of the most able discussions I have read on the subject of these miracles, that the Writer "does not recollect any event which ever occurred in this "country which has so much occupied the public attention "or excited so much public wonder, as the recovery of "Mrs. Stuart." Indeed the almost infinite number of articles and Pamphlets which that cure and the others classed with it gave occasion to, proves sufficiently the justice of this remark, and that those who glorified God in his works, or who in contemplating them felt the *imo sub pectore curas*, comprised nearly the whole of the community. That there were scoffers and many of them is but too true, and why should they not abound in our days as well as at all other times ? Whilst some went away from Calvary filled with awful reflections, or saying "surely this man was the son

* It is almost unnecessary to point this allusion. The reader will at once recognize the "Rhapsody," and "Apologetic Postscript."

“of God,” had not others passed by and blasphemed him, “shaking their heads and saying, Vah ! thou who destroyest the temple of God and in three days buildest it up again, save thyself : if thou be the Son of God come down from the Cross. And in like manner the chief Priests with the Scribes and Elders, mocking him said, “he saved others, himself he cannot save ; if he be the King of Israel let him come down from the Cross and we will believe him.” The People also cried out, “he saved others, let him save himself, if he be the Christ the Elect of God.” The Soldiers also made sport of him, coming and offering him vinegar and saying, “if thou be the King of the Jews save thyself.” And have I not said in my letter, that as the Disciple is not above the Master, nor the Servant greater than his Lord, that his truths and followers will always be a stumbling block to many, even in Israel, and the butt of reproach and ridicule to a profane and sinful world ?

But believing, as I do, that these cures were supernatural and divine, that they were wrought by the Spirit of Christ which animates his mystic body should I not expect they would be contradicted, reviled, and scoffed at, as he was himself ? Has the Church of God ever ceased to suffer as her founder did ? Even “in peace her bitterness has been most bitter.” Not only the Apostles but their successors in every age have been hated for their master’s name-sake ; and the miracles, with which they have never ceased to attest the Divinity of his Religion, have only ensured to them a portion of his chalice. “You seek to kill me,” says Christ to the Jews, “because my word hath no place in you.” And the vengeance which these carnal men would wreak on the HEAD, because they could not understand his words nor his works, that same vengeance has been inflicted upon the members—upon the Apostles and Martyrs in every age. The world hated them, as well as the miracles which they wrought, because they were not of the world.

I could not therefore, consistently with my Faith, have been grieved or disappointed, though some scoffed at what I respected. I should rather rejoice to find that whilst those whom I considered the children of the Church were favoured by God ; some were found by their conduct to verify the predictions of his Son. But my Faith is too copious to stop here, it believes also that it is only within our Church that true miracles are found ; because I believe it is there that Christ and the Father and the Spirit who alone can effect them, always abide. I believe that they are *one* of those many Graces given to assist the labourers, in planting, and watering the Vineyard—numerous and striking when the work is commencing—fewer as it advances ; but never entirely discontinued until the crop is gathered in. “He that believeth in me,” says the Redeemer, “the works that I do, he also shall do, and greater than these shall he do.” To disbelieve this promise requires on our part an apostacy from the Faith ; to limit its operation depends not on us, but on God ! The Disciples of Christ who were sent to preach the Gospel to every creature preparatory to the consummation, have been followed by the signs which he described or foretold. They might take up serpents or drink poison without being injured, and the imposition of their hands could cure diseases. Who will disprove the Miracles wrought in the Church according to this promise ? Who can deny their existence without rejecting the evidence which human testimony and public records exhibit in every age ? Is it because they are now less frequent than when the Church in its infancy had no other external support that they are to be denied ? Do not those great lights of Christianity, who account for the rarity of their occurrence, such as Irenæus, Augustine, Gregory, and Ambrose, attest of their own knowledge the existence of some ? And who can read the work of Benedict the 14th, *de Can. Sanctorum*, and consider the rigorous examination to which alledged miracles are subjected at Rome,

and not be satisfied, that no fraud with regard to them, is, morally speaking, possible? Men may disbelieve the Gospel, but as long as we Catholics retain our Faith, we will believe History, public records, and the solemn oaths of disinterested men : we will believe that miracles are wrought in our Church by the power of God for the propagation of the Faith or the consolation of his people.

In Deuteronomy it is written, "*Conglutinatus est Deus cum populo suo.*" God is united, is mixed up as it were, and made one substance with his people. He makes them by his incarnation partakers of his own nature, nourishing them with his own blood, as the Pelican does her young. He is patient towards them, and of much compassion ; so that whenever they ask any thing of the Father in his name, not hesitating, he has promised it will be given to them.—The grace of curing bodily diseases, as the Apostle testifies, was one of the first he granted to their infirmity and one which he will never withdraw from them, as perhaps there is no other so well calculated to excite their Faith and gratitude, and strengthen their confidence in his mercy. He wept over Lazarus before he raised him from the tomb, and was moved by the distress of the widow of Naim, before he stopped the bier and restored her son to life. His charity for his people well proves, that they have a high Priest who, encompassed himself once with infirmity, knows how to compassionate their distress. Hence the Church in all her liturgies prescribes prayers for the sick, in which her reliance on his promises is expressed, and did she not believe they are accepted, and cures wrought by their efficacy, her worship would not be Religion, but mockery and insult.

In her Rituals she prescribes, after the command of the Apostle, that if any one be sick amongst her children, the Priest do visit him and anoint him with oil, knowing that the Prayer of faith (as it is written) will save the sick man, and obtain for him not only the remission of sin, (should he be in sin) but also an alleviation of his sickness if condu-

cive to his salvation. The visible and sensible effects of this holy rite are daily witnessed in the Church. The Visitation of the sick, or a form of Prayer, (so inscribed in our Rituals) is another means which the Church employs to obtain from the Father of mercies bodily relief for the faithful who are indisposed, and Catholics know and experience, that the children at the breast, persons arrived at manhood, or declining to the grave, receive seasonable aid or an entire exemption from afflicting diseases, on the recital of these prayers for them by a Minister of the Church. We do not call these visitations of the divine mercy by the name of Miracles, because they are an ordinary effect of the divine Grace operating in the Church according to an established rule: but when the cure is sudden and extraordinary, surpassing the power of nature in the subject, exciting wonder also in the beholders, and the means of producing it such as the Church approves of, we deem it miraculous. I have said that “we Catholics can easily “believe,” in such cures; I repeat it, and I rejoice in repeating it; knowing that “the just one of the Apostle “liveth by faith,” and that if we had Faith as a grain of mustard seed, we might say to the mountain, “rise and be cast into the sea,” not indeed a silly and presumptuous faith by which we would believe that without cleansing our own hearts, and doing the good works we are commanded, that the justification or sanctification, or redemption wrought by Christ would be imputed to us—but a lively faith and firm confidence, by which we believe, that all God has revealed to us is true, and that he is powerful to fulfil to us, as he did to Abraham, all that he has promised; so merciful moreover as not only to make us believe in him, but also to become our Redeemer and Mediator and a propitiation for our sins; infusing his own justice and all his other virtues into our hearts by his Holy Spirit, which is given to us and in whom we cry “Abba Father;” nay who himself prays for us with ineffable sighs. This is the

faith of us Catholics by which “we easily believe,” that God is cemented with his people, and that his ear hears not only the petition of their tongues, but the very “preparation of their hearts;” afflicting them occasionally as children who by the correction of the cross he draws to himself; but never suffering them, because he is faithful, to be tempted beyond what they can bear. The scoffers who have laughed at the Miracles are unacquainted with this faith of ours: the unction of the Spirit, which teaches us does not render them docile, and hence all things must be *natural* to men, unacquainted with what is *supernatural*. They will descend with Spinoza to the *vis medicatrix naturæ*, and search for the attributes of the Divinity in the inertness or volubility of matter, or with Hobbes or Hume, they will disarm the Deity of his power, cast down with human liberty the essential landmarks of right and wrong, and with Rousseau doubt, or with the sage of Ferney to laugh at all that is sacred in the Gospel dispensation. They will do this, and, with a profaneness and insolence, peculiar to infidelity, affix names of reproach to characters the most blameless, filling their reviews or pamphlets with a silly bombast, which a man of letters, or a Christian, can scarcely peruse, but which gratifies the appetite of the unlettered and profane, as Lactantius has it, “*omnia enim stolidi magis admirantur amantque inversis quo sub verbis latitantia cernunt.*” But these scoffers, whom my opponent would represent as the Protestants of Ireland, are few; the latter generally are grave and religious in all their views. The ancient faith, however, has been ejected from them, and a creed has been composed for them, which they receive, partly or entire, as it listeth them; but they have been led away from the creed of their fathers. All its great leading principles are misrepresented or misapplied by their teachers, and, amongst the rest, a belief in that intimate intercourse, which Catholics believe to exist between the Church and her Spouse. He, these latter are taught, having washed her in his own

blood, nourishes her with the participation of himself, and pours out upon her the effusion of his spiritual love, until their happy progeny shall be filled up in the number of the elect, and she presented by him without spot or wrinkle, in the presence of his Father. The Protestants have had no miracles amongst them; they know not what they are, except in theory: they contemplate them as belonging to a Church from which they have been alienated; and their teachers by every resource within their reach represent, as fables, facts as well authenticated as the existence of Rome; or if they admit them, they assign them to Anti-Christ—to the capital enemy of the head and founder of this Church.

To suppose that any miracles, of whatsoever description, would produce the return of many of the Protestants of this country to the Mother Church, unless they were influenced by interior graces stronger than were ever yet imparted to any community of men, would, to me, appear absurd; I should be more than a novice in the history of mankind, as well as in my knowledge of the human heart, if I were to entertain such an opinion. To impute it to me, is as just as to suppose me capable of aiding or contributing, in any way, to the establishment of an undue influence, on the part of the Catholic Prelates over their flocks. If I know my own mind or my own heart, I am as little solicitous about influence in this world, as I am averse to every encroachment upon the right of man to treat with his Maker about the concerns of his soul. My opponent may then be assured, that I come to the consideration of his grave discussion on miracles, as unbiassed as any other individual who could be induced to join issue with him on such a subject. I am a sincere Catholic, and I believe those miracles to be divine. These are the data upon my part; but in the discussion, we must suffer nothing to be assumed.

Of the three propositions subjected to our scrutiny, the first regards the nature of the facts; “are they, or are

“they not miraculous?” The second, “whether the testimony, which sustains them, be sufficient to satisfy a clearly judging and impartial enquirer?”

The first argument of my opponent, is one “*ad Verendum*,” by which, screening himself under the shade of Doctor Cheyne and some other Doctors’ authority, he advances, almost in silence, to the never-ending topic of the nerves. Oh, happy Nerves! Were Erasmus now living, he would not select Folly as a theme for his praise, and pass by the unspeakable and incomprehensible beauty and convenience of the nervous system. This system, which can kill and cure, with equal facility, or administer relief to the dumb and hypochondriac; which can rescue life from the grasp of apoplexy, and say to him or her who has been bowed down with infirmity for years, “take up thy bed and walk”! *Le medicin malgre lui* of Moliere, was unacquainted with it, or bleeding and hot water would not have been his only specifics.

Exquisite system, and like the mines of Potosi, as yet, not half explored! Why were you not familiar with Hippocrates and Galen, or the incantations, by which you could be regularly excited to do your works of mercy, taught or sung in the days of Homer and Euripides? The batteries of your moral Galvinism have hitherto been unknown to us, and we pined and died, like our fathers, whilst you were in the midst of us, always ready, if only conjured by a rightful spell, to minister relief. We have at length, however, discovered the recesses where you sleep; we shall often have recourse to you; we will make you Queen of all chronic diseases, and proclaim you the Deity of the lame and blind — of the deaf and dumb! All this we promise you, provided you abandon those silly Papists, or not confine your favours to them alone. My correspondent will excuse this trifling. “*Ridentem dicere verum quid vetat?*” *

Doctor Cheyne, and Doctor Jacob, and Doctor Pseufer,

* See Note A.

and as many as my opponent may please to quote, assert that the influence of the mind upon the body, through the agency of the nervous system, is considerable, and in some cases exceeding great. Of this, no person, whom I have heard of, seems to doubt; but the fact, that in the whole history of practical medicine, no theory applicable to the excitement of the nerves, and the production of a healing influence, through their agency on the human frame, has as yet been discovered, is an argument beyond doubt that the physicians are only feeding the public with conjectures on this subject. What department of medicine is there, in which a series of facts are not adduced, in order to support by like experiments, some theory founded upon them? And why are we not favoured with such a series, proving that the nerves, excited to a certain degree, will enable the cripple to cast away his crutch,—the shattered frame to resume its vigour,—the many years infirmity to be removed,—the tongue which had been still, almost from its infancy to be loosed? Or are the nerves the only part of the frame which are inaccessible to the powers of medicine? Not baths, cold or warm, not batteries of Galvinism, nor shocks of electricity, not the power of the vegetable or mineral kingdoms can shake the nerves of an unhappy patient.* Oh no! when the nerves are to be wrought on, the mind alone can minister to them. Well, be it so; but what shall we say when we see fear, and love, and hope, and joy pass and repass through the mind of the sufferer, and yet no relief? “But these passions of the mind are not found in a degree sufficiently intense.” Intensity is relative, and one person is capable of it in a greater degree than another; but the different ages, sexes, and conditions of the persons cured, at the intercession of Prince Hohenlohe and of those who pray with him, shew that the excitements of the nerves, in all and each of them, could not be intense. “Oh, but excitement

* See note B.

“must not only be intense, but it must proceed from religion acting on the mind.” I should like to interrogate, on this subject, my friend, the Rev. H. Young, of Harold’s-Cross, or the Gentleman, quoted by the E. Reviewers, who witnessed the fervid piety of those who were *exciting their nerves*, at Harold’s Cross or the Chapel of George’s-Hill Convent, on the first of September last, in order to know, whether they are of opinion, that religion, acting on the mind, and the mind on the nerves, and the nerves upon the blood, and the blood upon the flesh, and the flesh upon the bone, or upon the sore, can or cannot effect a cure! Did they reply in the negative, I should be much inclined to credit them, in preference to Doctor Cheyne or Doctor Pseufer, for they had witnessed for several successive days, the progress and completion and failure of this excitement as it is technically called; and they are as *competent* to judge of a matter of fact, and fully as credible witnesses, as those Medical Gentlemen, however respectable. Did these witnesses or any others, profess to think that religious or nervous excitement, of a certain kind, can cure diseases, I would enquire, why were not those persons, who, with their nerves, as is supposed, all in motion, expected something like “the motion of the waters,” at Harold’s-Cross or George’s-Hill, all or generally cured? I know Mr. Young would tell me, as the only reason, that in the days of Elizeus, there were many lepers in Syria, but that none but Naaman was cleansed; and, that in the days of Elias, there were many widows suffering from famine, but to none of them was the Prophet sent, but to her of Sarepta in Sydon. My opponent thinks the failure of the nervous excitement, just mentioned, a miracle, or something approaching to it. I willingly leave him to the enjoyment of *his* miracle!

The authority of Physicians, upon such matters as these, is good thus far, that they are the best judges of the nature of disease in a certain patient, and may explain to us

should the matter be within the sphere of their knowledge, how or by what means a cure was effected; but to set up Physicians as judges of matters, with which their writings prove that they are very imperfectly acquainted, is not reasonable, even were they all agreed in opinion, but when the subject is to them as abstruse and unknown, as to any other member of the community, when we find them arrayed in divisions against each other, Doctor Mills, (as has been offered to be proved on oath,) differing from Doctor Cheyne, Doctor Sheridan opposed to Doctor Crampton, Doctor Magee (not the Archbishop, but a Doctor of Medicine) to Doctor Pseufer, Doctor Tuomy, perhaps, to Doctor Jacob, and Doctor Baddely for both sides of the question, I do confess, I pay but little attention to their opinions on a subject, which the difference of their sentiments, sufficiently proves they do not understand.

But it is said, "that the cures have been wrought chiefly "or exclusively on pious females, more susceptible than "others, of nervous impressions." This statement is not correct; for several men, as well females, have been healed. But though the objection were founded on fact, the person who believes the cure to be supernatural, finds in that an additional argument to support his belief, because he knows that the sex, whom the Church denominates "pious," are generally gifted with a more lively faith, and a more animated confidence in God, than men; and, therefore, better entitled to have their petitions accepted. We know how acceptable the sighs of Martha and Mary for Lazarus, and of the widow of Naim, and of the Syriac woman were to the Redeemer; how the daughter of Jairus, and the mother-in-law of Peter, she who laboured under the issue of blood, and the daughter of Abraham who for eight and thirty years, had suffered under infirmity, were cured by him; and to judge by the zeal of those who stood by the cross on Calvary, who awaited the Resurrection at the tomb, who assisted the Apostles in their ministry, and in-

introduced Christianity even into the Court of Cæsar, who have combatted in the circus or in the amphitheatre amongst the Martyrs, and practised in every age the very perfection of the Gospel virtue—to judge by the zeal and piety of those, of the rank which females hold in the estimation of the Lord, I do think we would not be led to despise them, nor postpone their claims on his compassion, to those of the more exalted sex; unless, indeed, we were to assist the persons whom the Lord should heal, like the author of “the Complete Exposure,” who laughs at a miracle, because it was said to have been operated on an humble mechanic, whose trade he mentions, by way of derision. The Fisherman, the Publican, the Tentmaker amongst the Apostles, would never surely have been selected for their office, had this civilian been the privy counsellor of the Lord.

But of this theory of the nerves, we could say to those who use it, (and it is the only argument, worthy of consideration, used by all those who combat with my opponent,) “*extra peram philosophantur* ;” for, even if it were as real as it is fanciful, it has not, in reality, a just application to the cases in question, as the persons cured, were not, at the time of their recovery, under any extraordinary degree of excitement whatever—they experienced that state of soul, and temperament of mind, which is attendant upon a calm and settled devotion, such dispositions as are recommended in the letter of the Prince, and which, for the greater part, are the same as every pious Catholic seeks to bring to the foot of the altar; they were of a meek and gentle kind, placid, humble, and resigned. There was a whirlwind, (I quote the substance, not the words of Elias,) and behold the Lord was not there, and again a strong wind and the Lord was not; and then a light and gentle breeze, and behold the Lord appeared. It is not in agitation, or trouble, or excitement of any kind, that the pious Christian expects to feel the grace or operation of the Deity; and the scoffers themselves would cease to laugh, did they experience

the calm repose, the sweet resignation, the perfect conformity to the will of God, which those persons enjoyed, at the moment they perceived within them the movement of an almighty and renovating power! Of a power which caused them to sink into the abyss of their own nothingness, or exclaim, in the language of the Seraph, "Holy, Holy, Holy Lord God of Hosts." Were the scoffers so favoured, they would find themselves far removed from that bitterness and overflowing of uncharitableness, by which they badly prove that they are the children of peace and love.

But if we permit ourselves, with these scoffers, thus to abandon an improved philosophy—to exchange the principles of a Bacon, a Newton, or a Locke, for those of Des Cartes, Mallebranche, or Woulfe, by substituting for analysis and facts, systems founded in fancy, what security will remain for us either in practical science or the business of life? What prudent man, when he finds water congealed, or ice dissolved, will seek for any other cause but heat or cold; will he proceed to conjure up some driftless system to account for an effect so obviously resulting from a well-known cause? Systems, indeed, are plausible, and easily impose upon a simple mind. I recollect, when a boy in College, to have read Buffon's theory of the Earth, and scarcely hesitated to consider it both just and reasonable. When more versed in that subject, I perceived how much I was deluded by appearances of truth. In such matters, however, as no passion prevails, the mind is easily withdrawn from error; but not so in moral and metaphysical hypothesis which, connecting themselves with the highest interests, are moreover encumbered with the pride and prejudices of sect and party.

The odious calumnies, and foul misrepresentations, by which our religion is blackened, I hesitate to add, though from the Apostle, "by lying teachers," induce some Protestants to regard it as something monstrous, to which no

favour could be granted by the Deity. To suppose that the Lord would be rendered propitious, by the sacrifice of the Mass, or the prayers of those who believe in transubstantiation—who invoke the Saints, and venerate the cross, is an effort of mind, of which, some amongst them, are not capable; and hence it comes, that when supernatural effects are produced in our Church, this portion of our brethren are predetermined not to believe—they close their eyes and ears to our arguments; and, should their teachers find no reason, in the nature of things, to support their disbelief, they have recourse to the inventions of fancy, to abuse, or declamation. They say, “could any thing good come from Galilee? it is in Beelzebub he casteth out devils.” Miss Lawler is restored to speech, in the prime of life, after a dumbness of several years—after the power of medicine and electricity had been tried in vain. She is restored in the Church suddenly, and perfectly, by the efficacy of sacrifice and prayer; and, whilst these obvious causes, which could be seen and almost touched, are rejected, she is told that her nerves, which for an instant were not discomposed, produced her cure. She herself swears before her God to what she felt and heard and believed; and she is told that it is all deception, that Doctor Cheyne is a better judge than she. Mrs. Stuart is diseased for several years, and the disease is of an apoplectic nature. I had myself seen her about eighteen months previous to her recovery; she was even then almost speechless, seemingly paralysed—her limbs appeared contracted, her features as if distorted, and so unsound, Lazarus was not an object more worthy of compassion. At length she is despaired of, and her miseries about to terminate, when behold prayer and sacrifice, in which she joins, are offered for her, and her cure is instantaneous and complete; but distortion, infirmity, the langour of death itself, sores, ulcers, and all the ruins produced by an apoplectic disease, are not removed by these obvious causes, but by nerves which never moved—by an

excitement which was not experienced, by the precipitation of the blood which might kill, but could not save !

Miss Dowell is so diseased for months, as to be enfeebled to such a degree, that the very movement of her frame might, in the opinion of her physician, produce dissolution. Relief is sought from God by those means which in all ages have been used agreeably to his own command, in order to obtain his mercy. She rises, and almost takes up her bed and walks ; and this is nerves. To suppose so, is not to be credulous, but it is to hoodwink faith and reason, and bring them into captivity to prejudice !

A poor boot-maker who had been leading for years a dying life, encompassed with all manner of infirmity, goes, supported on his crutch, to the temple to pray whilst the sacrifice is offered, and he returns bounding and praising God. But he is not deemed worthy to be taken under the protection of the nervous system, for no miracles could be wrought on a man *who closed boots* ! I have seen an old woman cured about the same time, who had been perhaps for twenty years stooped down to the earth almost, with some disease probably of the spine, and in whom poverty, cold, want and age weakened much the *elasticity of the nerves*. She prayed with an humble faith, and stood erect ; but why should not some hypothesis be devised to shew that her cure was a mistake, or that her disease belonged to some undiscovered class ?

My opponent will excuse me from not adducing other miracles, for though I could recount many, even some of men, and all *undoubted*, yet I think it quite superfluous to load my page with new illustrations of the nervous system.

“ But let the Prince prove *in any one unequivocal instance*, “ that he has the power of working miracles, and my opponent “ will be less disposed to question his pretensions ; let him “ restore a lost limb for example, or raise the dead to life.”

His Highness must feel much obliged for this indulgence.

Why our Lord only raised four persons to life, though the diseases which he cured were innumerable. I do not recollect that Peter raised any dead person to life, though his very shadow cured the sick. As to the setting of broken legs or making new ones, I don't find the Apostles employed in such-like operations. The curing of the ordinary diseases prevailing at the time, seems to me to have been the object of the Lord, and of his Disciples ; and chiefly perhaps because there is nothing sought after with so much avidity, nothing received with so much gratitude, as restoration to health ; so that he " who went about "doing good," as also his followers, employed themselves generally, when they wrought miracles, in such works of mercy as were most obvious and pressing, and which could best tend to direct the hearts of the multitude to heaven. To heal diseases was a part of the commission given to the seventy-two disciples.

Some, indeed, required a sign from Christ in the heavens, after he had wrought one upon earth, that they might *not question further his pretensions* ; but did he shew it to them? No, to that adulterous and sinful generation no further sign would be given, but the sign of Jonas the Prophet that is the RESURRECTION, and to those who at any time require a sign *after their own fancy*, from those who work miracles in the Church, no sign will be given but the sign of the Church itself, which, like a beacon on a high hill, exhibits herself to the world, but especially to the Christian world, as ready to receive and enlighten all the nations that flow to her ! One " Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic " beautiful as the moon, chosen as the sun, terrible as an army set in battle array !

But my opponent piques himself on the discovery of an argument which had escaped the sagacity of his predecessors, namely, that the miracles of our Lord, which the present miracles resemble, are believed, because they were wrought by him whose other miracles are beyond contro-

versy ; and which, if they stood alone, would, or might, be rejected.

In reply, I would beg to observe with him, that there were many of the miracles of the Lord *like* to those which we now treat of, from which it is just to deduce that *these also* may be true miracles, and should not therefore be scoffed at ! But to resume ; were the same objects now to be attained as in the time of Christ, namely, the establishment of the Christian religion, those commissioned to preach it, would, if necessary, work prodigies even greater than those wrought by him, for such is the tenor of his promise ; but where the Church is established, there is no such necessity. When the plant has struck root, as Gregory observes, it does not require to be constantly watered ; it is enough if it be sprinkled from time to time, with the overflowing of the dews of heaven—the ordinary graces originally granted to the Church. The grace of curing the sick, the favours assigned to humble and pious supplication, these are never withheld ; and though at sometimes they abound more, and at others less, they are always proportioned to the state and circumstances of the Church.

But as to the miracles wrought in after ages being considered as isolated, and not entering into that chain of prodigies which commenced at Bethelam, and will end in the Valley of Josaphet, this view of them will never enter into the mind of a Catholic. The miracles now wrought are in our judgment, as intimately connected with the raising of Lazarus and the resurrection of the Lord, as those wrought by Paul. The Church is always one, ever ancient and ever new ; like her Founder, she may be said to be yesterday, to-day, and for ever ; all that is done in her, is done by HIM, in whom, and by whom, all things consist and are ; before whom a thousand years are as one day, and one day as a thousand years.

But I come to the testimony on which these miracles are asserted to have taken place, and which is justly required by

this writer "to be unexceptionable in the highest degree;" and indeed unless with those who believe that we Catholics have a license to commit perjury, I cannot well conceive any ordinary events better testified, than such of these miracles as have been juridically proved. The cure of Miss Lawler is proved to have occurred, as set forth in the published documents, not only by the notoriety of the fact itself, but also by the affidavits of three lay gentlemen, two clergymen, of the young lady herself, and of her mother. The recovery of Mrs. Stuart is sworn to, by four religious ladies, by an attendant maid, and by two clergymen. The Apostle, as a rule of evidence, says, "in the testimony of two or three witnesses every word shall stand," and "against a priest "do not receive an accusation, unless on the evidence of two "or three;" but St. Paul probably had not practiced in the courts mentioned in "the Complete Exposure," or had not learned the wisdom of this world as perfectly as it is known in our times. The other miracles referred to, have for their support only such proof as the crowds who witnessed them could furnish—proof very like to that which the centurion's family, or that of the chief of the synagogue, or of the Phenician woman, could furnish of the cures wrought in their presence—such, in all probability, as the nineteen-twentieths of the miracles wrought by Christ and his Apostles could be attested by; and as to physicians in these days, unhappily they seem to be overlooked altogether. We however, have treated the faculty with more deference; for where certificates were attainable they were procured, short indeed, and dubious, as if Dr. Doyle himself, or some such Jesuit presided to see that no triumph were given to either party; and where the feelings of wonder and surprise outran the caution of these gentlemen, there affidavits made, or threatened to be made, elicited or proved their judgment! What more need my opponent wish to have, unless he be a Jew or an unbeliever, or could we

seek for Hindoos, Japanese, or cannibals in a Christian country? or summon to the bed-side of infirmity all who walked the streets, or to our churches those who would not enter them if an angel called? Or who again does he suppose can testify, but those who saw, and heard, and touched?—And if the Church need testimony of what occurs within herself, must she, forsooth, distrust her own children, bearing witness to her of what her spouse, their father had done for them? Not so the courts of law, for they admit the child to prove what concerns his parent or his brother, well knowing, that to a Christian, the God of Truth and Justice is much more dear and awful than mortal man, even though he be a father. To those who believe us all impostors, we do not appeal, nor wish to offer them a new occasion of blaspheming God, and violating his first and best commandment, to love each other, to do to others in word and work, as we would have them to do to us.

But the witnesses “are an interested Priesthood and their deluded followers.” Such the scoffers believe, were the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin and his clergy who scrutinized and judged of these Miracles. Men thereby rendered guilty of betraying Christ, and of selling his truth and glory for something more base and paltry than the pelf of Judas! But it is adduced as an objection, that no persons not Catholics were cured. Even if that were the case, the objection would be trivial, for the grace of cures belongs to the church, and though it is what we in our theology call “*a gratia gratis data*,” “a grace given to be employed for the good of others,” it is seldom extended where the Church is established, beyond her pale: but the case is otherwise, for if J. K. L. deserve credit, or a Rev. gentleman his informant, who has lately been at Bamberg, nine Protestants were cured, sometimes previous to his being there, of various diseases.

But we come to the third and last part of our discussion,

namely “of what value a real and well authenticated Miracle is, in establishing the superiority of a particular religious system?” Though this question is somewhat irrelevant, yet, as my opponent has introduced it for the purpose of giving place to certain remarks, as ungenerous as they are unjust; I am not unwilling to follow him through it. I shall, however, previously insert the published letter of the Prince D. Hohenlohe, to the magistrates of the district of Wurtzburg, in Germany, in which his Highness explains the objects for which the Almighty, as he supposes, is pleased to work these cures. I shall add a sketch of some of the cures themselves, that the public may be the better enabled to judge both of their nature and end:—

“Most Worthy Magistrate of the Royal Metropolis
“of the District of Wurzburg.”

“To your kind favour concerning the instantaneous cure of the Princess Schwartzenberg, I have the honor to reply in strict conformity with the truth, as follows:

“The instantaneous cure of the Princess is a fact which cannot be called in question. How did it happen? It was the result of a lively faith in the power and divinity of the name of Jesus, which, invoked with firm confidence and remembrance of the words of Scripture; *If you ask the Father any thing in my name, he will give it you*; and through his divine and immediate interposition, most graciously granted to her who was in need of help, deliverance from her infirmity; and in the pure and simple intention, that thereby God Almighty might be praised and magnified, and his only begotten Son, to whom the Father has given all power in heaven and on earth, be glorified by such an event; and that faith in the divinity of Jesus, which in these days is so much fallen away, might be revived amongst the many denominations of Christians, who are

“ withheld by human pride from bowing down their under-
 “ standing to faith.

“ We may demand such a cure of Almighty God, for
 “ the more perfect discharge of the duties which God him-
 “ self has imposed upon our calling, in order to his honor
 “ and our soul’s good ; and that our Mother the holy Catho-
 “ lic Church, may be glorified, who grants such power to her
 “ faithful children, to prove that she is the only true Church
 “ of God.

“ This active and lively faith and pious intention are al-
 “ ways in the power of him who is in need of help ; and thus
 “ he may expect the speedy co-operation of heavenly succour.
 “ This was undertaken for the Princess. *It was done to her*
 “ *as she believed.*

“ With every sentiment of respect, &c.

“ ALEXANDER, Prince of Hohenlohe,
 Spiritual Counsellor.”

Wurzburg, June 22, 1821.

At Wurzburg he commenced those extraordinary actions which have astonished and are astonishing all the nations of Europe.

Francis Nicholas Baur, Vicar and Dominicalis Major of the Ancient Chapter of Wurzburg, has given in twelve Letters an authentic account of the remarkable occurrences performed by the Prince during his residence of twenty-four days in that city.

Over his bed hangs the identical Crucifix used by the great St. Francis Xavier, in the Indies, a present from his Holiness Pius VII. He has chosen for his companion a man truly religious, of low condition, named Michel, of his own country—who unites with him in * prayer, pre-

* Martin Michel lives at Unterwittinghausen, a village which formerly belonged to Wurzburg, but now belongs to Baden, five leagues from this place ; and he is the brother-in-law of the professor who formerly lived here, Doctor Bergold, now Rector of Hassfurt, in the circle of the Lower Maine.

vious to the working of his miracles. These prayers do not consist of long-sounding words, of formal bombast, and multiplied titles, such as the Heathens made to their gods, but with faith and fervor, he says with the Apostles, in “*the name of Jesus arise, thy faith hath healed thee.*”

With perfect confidence he has restored persons declared incurable: he has made the blind to see—the deaf to hear—the lame to walk, and paralytics he has perfectly cured.

‘The number of cures performed in the above-mentioned city, and which are enregistered, are more than one hundred; among these are Princess Matilda, of Schwartzenberg, who was cured, after being lame from her 8th to her 17th year: 80,000 florins had been spent in medical advice for her, and fourteen days before the Prince saw her, her life was despaired of.

‘It was only with the most violent pain that she could lie in a horizontal position, and only by means of a machine constructed by Mr. Heine, could she be something freer from pain in bed; because it supported her and brought her nearer to a perpendicular direction; and in this state the Prince of Hohenlohe found her, where praying with him and his disciple Martin Michel, and with full confidence in God, at his command to arise, she was instantly cured. She stepped out of bed alone, threw the machine from her, was dressed, and walked afterwards in the Courtyard, and in the Garden, performed her devotions the next morning in the Church, with praises and thanksgivings, visited the Garden of the Court and Julius’ Hospital, and went on the 24th instant, in company with her Serene Highness the Princess of Lichtenstein, born Princess of Esterhazy His Serene Highness the Duke of Aremberg, also her uncle, his Serene Highness the Prince of Baar, and others, to the Sermon of the Prince of Hohenlohe, in the Collegiate Church of Haug, and continues to this hour perfectly well.

“The public will do well to reflect on this,” says Father Baur, “and the more so, as on the preceding, as well as on the 20th of June in the morning, the Princess could neither turn herself in bed, nor stand on either of her feet! The Crown Prince of Bavaria, who was deaf, was restored to his hearing.

“On the Prince’s way from Wurzburg he was met by several vehicles full of sick persons; he stopped, got out of his carriage, and healed them. In Essleben he did the same. In Hassfurt, four leagues from Schweinfurt, he healed five persons. We continue to receive intelligence of him.— There came a letter from Bamberg, of the 3d instant, where the Prince has begun to perform cures as he did here.

“He restored two sisters to the use of their limbs, who had not left their beds for ten years. The counsellor Jacob who had been confined to his room for four years, accompanied his deliverer from the third story down to the house-door. The upholsterer, Mr. Kauer, who had been long ago given up by the physicians, is seen abroad again. The beneficed clergyman, Rev. Mr. Sollner, of Hallstadt, before the residence of the Prince, in the presence of a number of persons, was cured of the gout as he sat in the carriage, and immediately alighted, and went through the town on foot, Mr. Deuerling, the saddler, can now look after his workmen without stick or crutch, &c.

“On the morning of Saturday, the 30th of June, a chaise drove up to Staufenberg’s hotel. It was immediately conjectured, that it had brought some poor creature in need of help, and actually an old man, by trade a butcher, was carried out of it in sheets into the hotel; for all his members were so crippled, that he could not be touched with hands. The crowd assembled before the place in the hotel, were astonished to see a person so extremely afflicted, and many said aloud, ‘If this man be cured, the finger of God will be manifest.’ The whole multitude were full of ex-

pectation for the event. After a time a lady was heard in the hotel, calling out of the window to those in the windows of the adjoining house: "Good God! the man is cured!—He can walk already!" The crowd below were now more eager with expectation; when another lady called out to them: "Clear the way before the door, the man is coming out! let him have a free passage!" The man came out, and walked to his chaise; but after driving a little way he stopped the coachman, and desired him to take him back to the gracious Prince, as through excessive joy he had forgotten to return him thanks.

"In the afternoon a young man was brought from Burglauer, who had studied divinity here two years before, but from a disorder in his legs, had lain since that time in constant and excessive pain. His friends in the seminary had pressed him to come hither, and they moreover induced his Serene Highness, as the sick man could not leave his bed in the carriage, to come out to him. He encouraged the sufferer to great confidence in the power and goodness of God and then prayed over him, and told him to arise in the name of Jesus. The first time, the sick man could not arise. His Serene Highness repeated the prayer, and the man declared that all his pain had left him. The Prince prayed a third time, and to the astonishment of the immense crowd assembled before the Staufenberg Hotel, when he called out "Arise!" the sick man raised himself upright in his bed. Every one was amazed to think how languid and emaciated had been the state of this man, who now stood before them with a countenance beaming with joy; whereas, a moment before, he had lain to all appearance at the point of death. Both his feet were before quite dead, for pins had been run into his flesh, and he felt nothing of them.

"Other remarkable cures have been wrought at the following places. Upon the sister of Mrs. Broili, the grocer, who lay under the physician's care almost dead, but was

healed on the spot, and now enjoys full health and vigour. Likewise on a book-keeper of her's, a native of Volkach; whose speech was greatly affected by a disorder in his tongue, but who now speaks perfectly well.

“ The child of Mr. Gulemann, who was attended by medical men, being entirely blind; but was restored on the spot, and to this hour remains blessed with perfect sight.

“ A most remarkable case was the cure of the wife of the forester Kiesling; and that of the Clerk of the Courts, Mr. Kandler, who had almost given up all hopes of relief from physicians, and was perfectly healed of a lingering disease.

“ Moreover, the daughter of Mr. Mel, the King's cellarer, who was deaf; she ran about the house, crying out for joy, “ I can hear perfectly well ! ” Previous to his departure on the 11th of July, his Serene Highness worked the following cures, among many others, which are certainly miraculous in their kind.

“ A boy of four years old was brought from Grossenlangheim, who, for three years and a half had one of his eyes entirely covered by the eyelid, so that no one could tell whether the eye existed at all; and his other eye was covered with a film. This boy was so perfectly restored by the prayers of the Prince, that both his eyes are now sound and well, and the same afternoon he went up and down all the steps of the *Quanteischer* House in this place.

“ A wine merchant came from Königshöfen, whose hands and feet had been for four years so much contracted, that his hands were fast clenched like a fist, and he could scarcely use them at all. This man was instantaneously restored, so that he can stand upright on his feet, and walk, and also open and shut his hands, and enjoys the perfect use of them. It is remarkable also, that from the long and close clenching of his hands, the nails have produced a kind of horny substance in the hand like corns.

“ A man from Schwemelsbach, who had not been able for eight years to raise himself once in his bed, was brought in a carriage before the residence of the Rev. Prince, who was just about to begin a journey. The Prince was in the greatest haste, but still wished to relieve this afflicted man, and accordingly opened his window, and began to pray from it ; desiring the sick person to pray at the same time. After giving him his blessing, he called out to the man to arise. This he could not do, and the prayer was repeated, where-upon the sick man raised himself a little, and declared that he was quite free from pain. The prayer was again repeated, and then the man arose entirely by himself, got out of the vehicle, went from thence to the Collegiate Church of Haug, and there returned thanks to God for his deliverance.— Who would think of pretending that in this case there could have been any application of magnetism : when from the Prince, who spoke and prayed from his widow up stairs, to the sick man, there was so great a distance, as to render breathing upon him, and much more touching him, quite impossible.

Mr. William Talbot writes as follows.

“ I deem it right, and conducive to the greater glory of Almighty God, to state the following, which occurred on the 22d of May last, in the presence of John Talbot, Esq. nephew and heir of the Right Hon. the Earl of Shrewsbury, and his lady, in his Highness's own Palace of Bamberg, as related to me by them at Brussels, in the month of June last. The fact is as follows :

“ During a visit they paid his Highness on the day above-mentioned, a woman labouring under a deafness, which had baffled the best medical assistance in Germany, was perfectly and instantly cured on the Prince only saying a prayer over her, to the astonishment of all present ; a proof of which was, her replying to questions put in the lowest tone of voice, at the extremity of a very long gallery of the palace, not only by the Prince himself, but by Mr. and

Mrs. Talbot, and other company, who were in the room at the time.

“ A lady of high rank in France, and who had travelled 300 miles to see his Highness, had been instantly cured on the preceding day of an ulcer in her face, by the imposition of his hands, as she related it herself to Mrs. Talbot. In fine, I should never end, were I to relate the various wonders wrought, under God, by this most holy and amiable ecclesiastic.”

By firm confidence in *God, with God, and by God*, he performs these cures ; possessed of a most lively and animated faith in the Divine power, he requires from the sufferers explicitly a firm confidence *in God, that he can and will help them, and that in the name of Jesus they will be effectually cured.*

“ On May the 3d, 1822, a supernatural cure has taken place in the person of Miss Barbara O'Connor, of New-Hall, near Chelmsford, which has caused the astonishment of all the physicians and surgeons who attended her, among whom was the celebrated anatomist, Mr. Carpue, as the disease itself, which consisted in a total deprivation of motion, attended with excruciating pain and a prodigious swelling, and baffled their utmost skill for the preceding year and a half. To be brief, they recommended amputation of the limb, as the best thing to be done in so desperate a case, particularly on May 2d, the day preceding the cure. In the mean time, Prince Hohenlohe of Bamberg, whose name is celebrated for the supernatural cures he has wrought, having been applied to by a friend of the young Lady, he promised to say Mass for her at eight o'clock in the morning of that day, May 3d, and directed her to hear Mass and receive the Holy Communion at the same time. This she punctually performed ; when suddenly, at the last Gospel of the Mass, she perceived a slight shock in her shoulder, which darted to the extremity of her fingers. In a word, she was perfectly restored to the use of her hand and arm,

and freed from the pain with which she had been so long tormented. In a late number of *L'Ami de la Religion et du Roi*, we have an account of a miraculous cure resembling the last mentioned in many particulars. Mlle. Marie Licol, of Gremonville, in the Lower Seine, aged thirty-eight, had been afflicted with a paralysis of the left arm and hand, which rendered them quite motionless since the year 1815, and withered them to the appearance of a dead limb. Application being made by Letter to Prince Hohenlohe, he directed the patient to hear Mass and receive the Holy Communion on Palm Sunday, March 21, 1822. She complied, when, immediately after communicating, her hand and arm were restored to their natural powers and healthful appearance.

On the 11th of March, 1823, a young female, of Verdellain, Diocese of Bordeaux, in France, was restored in the Church, on the day and hour prescribed by the Prince, to the use of speech, after five years privation of that faculty.

On the 13th of June, 1823, Miss Mathers, of Bouverie-street, Fleet-street, London, by attending to the wise prescriptions of the Prince, was miraculously cured of a most excruciating nervous complaint, which she had for the period of eighteen months. *

The above-mentioned Lady received a Letter from the Low Countries, giving an account of another miraculous cure operated through the prayers of his Serene Highness, on one who had been confined to bed for the space of 30 years.

Behold, then, the man and his works, not, indeed, juridically proved, nor bringing with them the seal of any faculty, but such as they are presented to us by the history of our time, like the events which we hear of as passing in South America, or Greece, with this difference, that these cures occurred nearer home, and are connected with others wrought amongst ourselves. Doubt should not, therefore, attach to their existence more than to that of any other

* See note C.

public event. As to the "*cui bono*," we see the Prince mentions many ends which the Almighty might propose to himself in the exhibition of these cures, to wit, "that He "and his only Son Jesus might be glorified (for which end he made all things originally)—to furnish new proofs of the Divinity of Christ so generally questioned or denied at present, in Germany, in Britain, and even amongst ourselves—to strengthen and reanimate the piety of the faithful, that they may proclaim, with increased zeal, the glory of God—and lastly, thus to exhibit to the world the superior privileges of that holy Church, whose children are thus singularly favoured.

I have stated these preliminaries, to shew, that neither the Prince himself, nor the Catholic Prelates, have at any time asserted, that the end of these wonders was to establish the superiority of "*their system of religion*," as it is quaintly called; indeed they do not consider that for this, any extraordinary proof is required, or has been necessary these fifteen hundred years, since the Church was first established; or, again, "to convert the Protestants," for though this seems to be conjectured by Doctor Murray, he could contemplate the conversion, even of many of them, only as an accidental contribution to the glory of God.

Whosoever will take the trouble of casting his eye over the pastoral letters, published by his Grace, and by Doctor Doyle, will clearly perceive the ends which they considered as promoted by these cures. From those letters, also, it is clear, that these Prelates, whilst they declared the cures to be supernatural and divine, did not, more than the Prince himself, attribute them exclusively to the intercession of his Highness. They knew, indeed, that "the prayer of "a just man availeth much," but they were also taught, that where two or three are assembled, in Christ's name, that he is in the midst of them, and, that whatsoever they ask the Father, for the Son's sake, is granted them. These united supplications had been put up by the Prince's own direc-

tion, and they, accompanied or followed by the most acceptable sacrifice of the new law, together with the faith of the patients, were the means stated to have produced the cures.

It did not enter into the minds of those Prelates, either to judge of the special end which the Almighty proposed to himself in relieving the infirmity of a few of his creatures, or to canonize the Prince Hohenlohe as a Worker of Miracles, however they might venerate him, for no Bishop presumes, during the life-time of any person, *to judge* that miracles have been wrought by him. To do so, is the special prerogative of the Holy See, as Ben. XIV. shews at large in his work *De Can. SS. Tom. 2* and 4th; and hence, whilst I proceed to discuss the third question proposed by my opponent, I have disengaged it from all necessary connection with our former subject.

Miracles then considered abstractedly, are not always certain signs, either of the sanctity of those who work them, or of the truth of their doctrine. Christ himself not only permits us, but even orders us to examine both miracles, and those by whom they are performed. "If you be told," says he, "here is the Christ or there, believe it not, for "there will arise false Christs and false prophets who will "do great signs and prodigies." *Matth. xxiv.* Moses, in *Deut. ch. xiii.* had said before of false Prophets and workers of wonders whose predictions would even be verified, that if they afterwards invited the people to go after strange Gods they should not be followed, for the Lord only wished to prove by them the fidelity of his people. So it will be with Anti-Christ, of whom Paul and John foretel, that he will work such wonders as would deceive, if it were possible, even the very elect. The proof then deduced from miracles is never certain or necessary, unless the character of him who appeals to them, be not only without reproach, but distinguished by the purity and sanctity of his life, as well as the truth of his doctrine; since the establishment

of the Church, he must also prove his mission from her, his submission to those who rule her, and his union with the Saints, and with those whose life and doctrine have always been approved.

If an angel from heaven seemed to come and work miracles upon the earth, unless he came accompanied with this commission, and those marks, no Catholic would receive him. It is thus that we, of all others, are most secure against the seductions, artifices, and wonders to be wrought by the Man of Sin, or Antichrist, who like a demon who seeks to transform himself into an angel of light, will endeavour to imitate the true miracles wrought by Christ and his followers. Upon us, whilst we continue to profess our creed, his labours must be lost ; whilst those persons would, indeed, be liable to great temptation, who say, like I believe the author of the " Complete Exposure," that if we would raise the dead to life, or heal miraculously a broken limb, he would not hesitate to embrace our creed ;" for Antichrist undoubtedly will appear to do this, and even what is perhaps more surprising, for he will cause fire to descend from the heavens, and cause the true believers to appear more vile and contemptible than the poor boot-closer himself !

My present opponent is generous enough to spare us the mortification of his joining in the silly cry about Antichrist, unless we appropriate to ourselves, in despite of his forbearance, " the marks of the beast." But there is another kindly-hearted correspondent of Doctor Doyle, whose ranks, he says, are still unbroken, not having, more than Sancho's master after his encounter with the wind-mill, one man killed, wounded, or missing ; to him I owe many apologies for the little notice I have taken of him, though certainly I respect exceedingly his pious zeal. Were he versed in Spanish literature, I would refer him to an ingenious and ludicrous work of Fejo's, to learn the reason why I have been wanting in courtesy to his precious trifle ;

but as I really have not time or inclination to treat of horns, crowns, and sulphur, he will be pleased to consult a dissertation of Calmet prefixed to his commentary on the the Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians, and he will find there much more than I could say upon his favourite subject. But before we part, let me express a hope that should we live to see this Man of Sin, that we may be amongst those just who will cry to the Lord from the Mount of Olives, as Lactantius says, and who will be delivered by Christ ; for he will come from heaven with his angels, preceded by a flame of fire ; then the angels united with the just, will destroy the hosts of Antichrist ; from the third hour till night the carnage will be such, that blood will fill the valley like a torrent ; it is then Antichrist, abandoned by all will be slain in his own tent, and upon his own throne, and there will be no one to compassionate his end. Surely this must be a consoling spectacle to Doctor Doyle's correspondent !

Dr. Doyle, I am confident, awaits with the most perfect composure for the coming of those events, and seated in the Church upon a rock, with Christ presiding and governing by his spirit, he does not fear apostacy, or that the children will desert their father, or deny his name. Their forehead or hand never he is certain will be marked by any other sign than *that* in which they glory, and for which with the Apostle they will never blush. They require no new teacher, no other mediator than the *one* who has become a propitiation for their sins, nor look for signs or prophecies except from HIM who promised to be with them all days, even to the end ; who conquered the world for his little flock, and caused them to encrease and multiply until they filled the earth. Let those, who tossed about by every wind, as clouds deprived of water wander through the air or fall in mists which do not fertilize but blight, let them consider Antichrist and watch his coming, for he too will deal in novelities, be filled with lies, and quote like Lucifer the word of

life ; his pride and power will be great, but he will arise from earth, will have his origin in time, the day of his coming will be marked as that of Arius or Luther, his reign whether long or short will end, but the Church will be taken up to God with Christ, with whom the Saints will reign for ever !

But I have digressed from where I stated the view which Catholics take of miracles. Those of which there is now question we do not advance as necessary proofs of the truth of *our religious system* ; that system has quite enough of proof without them, and instead of trying it by them, we regard them as only one of the numberless arguments which the Church offers to the world, of being the depository of Christ's graces, and the heiress of his promises. But this writer speaks of "*the blessed effects of her doctrine, the purity and reasonableness, and the scriptural foundation of her doctrines.*" SILLY MAN, WITH WHOM WOULD SHE CONTEST THESE THINGS, AS YOU WOULD HAVE IT. OR WHO WOULD PRESIDE IN JUDGMENT OVER HER TO WHOM ALL POWER IS GIVEN BY HIM TO WHOM THE FATHER CONSIGNED ALL JUDGMENT, OR COULD SHE TEACH A LIE, WITH WHOM CHRIST IS PRESENT TEACHING ALL DAYS EVEN TO THE END ? The blessed effects of her doctrine ! is it the civilization almost of the world at different periods, and the attraction of all nations to the faith of Christ this writer means ? "The purity and reasonableness of her doctrines !" who has ever disputed them, except those who rebelled, like Core, Dathan, or Abiron ? "The scriptural foundation of her doctrines," How, Sir, permit me to ask, do you know what is scripture or what is not, but from her, and who can judge of its sense, as Tertullian observes with Vincent of Lerins, and every man not swayed by some *religious system*, but SHE *with whom the Scriptures and their interpretation and sense, the whole property, right and title of them were originally deposited ?* Is it Manes you would invite to tell their meaning ? or Arius, or Vigilantius, or Æcolempadius, who paraphrased

them into a most ludicrous ritual, whereby to wed his wife ? “ Prove the spirits, saith John, for many false prophets “ have gone out into the world.” Ah we know this truth well, and having proved them, we frequently expel them, before like wolves they would clothe themselves in the lamb’s skin ; but whether we cast them from us or they depart, we say with the Apostle, “ they went out from us, “ because they were not of us, for if they were of us, they “ surely would have remained with us.”

Again, Paul tells Timothy, “ that after the manner of the Egyptians” who resisted Moses (be it observed) and all his wonders, “ corrupt men shall withstand the truth.” Yes, and therefore he besought him to preserve the deposit which he had entrusted to him before many witnesses, and to commit the same to faithful men who would be fit to teach others ; because, as he justly observes, “ evil men and *seducers shall “ grow worse and worse, erring and driving into error, men “ corrupted in mind, reprobate concerning the faith, re- “ sisting the truth as Jannes and Mambres resisted Moses.”*

But as a proof of the corruption of our *religious system*, this writer imputes to us the belief THAT A BIT OF BREAD IS GOD ! horrible though not unprecedented blasphemy ! This, however, is a diversion made, not for the sake of argument, (for the writer must have known it was a falsehood he advanced) but to engage on his side the prejudices of the ignorant and besotted amongst the Protestants ; he wished to bear down J. K. L., and as the miser or spendthrift seeking for gain says, *si rem bene...si non quocumque modo rem*, if he could not effect his purpose by argument, he would do it by a gross and insulting calumny.

It is not the least remarkable occurrence of the present time, that some of the most violent and vituperative writers against our rights and religion, such as the person to whom the “ Observations” are in part attributed, should be, not like the hero celebrated by Tasso, who though he had fallen from the faith, still retained the finest principles of the

Gospel with all the heroism of a warrior ; but like those renegadoes of whom we read in the histories of Genoa and Venice, who seemed possessed by some wicked fiend from the moment they put on the turban.

Transubstantiation, an absurd and blasphemous doctrine !! Yes, and this writer has sworn on the Evangelists, or declared solemnly before heaven, not *what he believed of us*, but that *our belief* in transubstantiation and in the sacrifice of the Mass, our invocation of saints, &c. really is blasphemous ; nay what is worse, pure unmixed idolatry.

This writer, if formerly a Catholic, knew as well as I do, that such oath when taken by him was pure unmixed perjury, and such declaration by him absurd and blasphemous. For however Protestants may reconcile such oaths and declarations to their conscience, from their ignorance of our tenets, no person educated in the Catholic faith can fail to know they are such as I have stated ; for though the blessed Eucharist were in reality nothing else than bread and wine, this writer knows that we do not worship either, nor adore those things which appear to our sight and touch, but Christ who is invisible. If Christ be present, as we believe he is, our worship is just and righteous ; if he be not, we are in error, and our adoration has no object in the sacrament. It may be said that the adoration must terminate somewhere, and so it does ; it terminates in Christ, if not upon the altar, certainly in heaven ; but in no case does it terminate in bread. Even many enlightened Protestant divines have thus candidly stated our doctrine.

Adoration, worship, are acts of the inmost soul of man, "and who" as Solomon saith "can know the sense of man" but the spirit of man which is within him ;" who therefore can swear, and adjure the majesty of God to witness the truth when he swears, that I am an idolator if I worship Christ present if he be as I am sure he is, upon our altar ; or if he be not, when I worship him in heaven where he is. To swear that one believes a certain doctrine as expounded,

to be false, is not unfair, though sometimes rash ; but to swear that the adoration of the host as practised in the Church of Rome is idolatry, is rash I fear in all ; is false in those who know our doctrine. Idolatry is an act of the mind whereby we give to something created the supreme honour due to God alone ; and do we give this honour to wine and bread ? The child at the breast could cry we do not ; the beams of the roof of the temple could answer we do not. We give it to the Father and to the Son who is consubstantial to him, and *who was made man*, to them and to the Spirit who proceeds from them we give supreme worship. What seems bread in the Eucharist, we value not. Those accidental qualities of bread and wine which we distinguish from the substance, but which yet are tangible and would suffice like carnal food to nourish the body, are not the object of our worship ; but that immortal and impassible GOD made MAN which they conceal : HIM we worship. And what is transubstantiation but a consequence as necessary from the real presence as light is from the sun ? “ Christ having risen from the dead, says the Apostle, “ dies no more, death shall no more prevail over him.” His body thus imbued with glorious qualities far beyond our frail conception, is *verily and indeed* (to use the words of another liturgy) *given and received*. It is not Christ as God only who now descends, for in him as such “ we always “ live, and move, and have our being,” but he descends as God and man indivisibly conjoined, with flesh as he produced it from the virgin, or raised it from the tomb ; and if he do, and is made present thus, when we break bread as he commanded us, not in our own name or by our own power but by his, for we do not say “ this is *his* body,” but this is *my* body ; if when we thus break bread or bless the cup, *he is there* as we are all agreed, Canterbury, Augsburgh, Rome, Constantinople, and the East—*is his flesh not present in the place of bread ?* or if not, how is it true, that THIS—THIS which I hold and press, is MY BODY, that is, the body

of Christ? Where shall we turn to escape this truth, or why not believe that he who comes from heaven to be present, as all allow, takes for his flesh the place which bread just occupied, preserving those accidental qualities of it which screen him from our sense, and which in our language are inaccurately called appearances. For though they are distinct from the elements or substance which have been changed or transubstantiated, yet all our teachers, witness Bellarmin, Bossuet, and the rest, assert that these accidental parts can nourish or inebriate like other food.

What then is transubstantiation, but the presence of Christ's real body in the sacrament? and who, as Calvin said, can believe in the one, and yet deny the other? all there is mysterious and incomprehensible, as the confession of Augsburgh well expresses it. But is not Christianity all mysterious? A God, Supreme and One, whose eternal wisdom or whose Word remaining in him, yet proceeds abroad and founds the heavens; whilst the connecting love of both, abiding always with them, yet proceeds from them and gives to the creation all its ornament and virtue; as light and heat from the sun proceed with powers as wonderful as the great source from whence they flow. And this word-made-flesh, this God-made-man, giving of his fullness to all who believe, is not this mysterious? And the atonement which he made for man, and the propitiation of that fault which Adam committed, is it not incomprehensible? And yet we believe, because we know that God has told it; and if he walked on earth, and was seen by men, and lived and died amongst us in that servile form which he took, and promised to bestow upon those whose feet he washed, an earnest of his love,—a bond of union for his people,—a source of grace for his elect,—a pledge of resurrection and of future glory,—shall we disbelieve him because he said it was his body, not cut into particles, as the gross Capharnaïtes thought, but veiled as bread and wine, to nourish and exhilarate the soul?

Can he who called the world out of nothing, or who moved on the abyss, putting chaos into order, who slept in Bethelhem, was numbered among the wicked, who bled between two thieves, whilst all the hosts of heaven worshiped him above, can he not take his place within the breast of man and disseminate his virtues through the soul, as the diamond sheds its lustre in obscurity ?

Surely he can, nor does he here deceive our sense, for he has told us he would be with us, and as we believe that “ *God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself.*” though we could only see or touch the form of man in which he was ; so when he says, “ *this is my body,*” we can believe the truth of what he says, just as we could believe that he was hidden on the Cross. For surely that Deity which could conceal himself can also ravish from our eyes the glorious and impassible flesh, which in heaven or earth is always with him, and partaking, as far as it is capable, of his glory. This flesh does not corrupt in us, or feel vicissitude or change, but when the veil which covered it is dissolved, it then departs with that divinity and soul of Christ from which it never was disjoined. Wonderful and incomprehensible, it is true, yet only like the other mysteries of Christian faith !

And whilst my pen runs upon this subject, let us see the Mass, and what it is in which this transubstantiation is effected.

The priest who blesses or consecrates the bread, is one succeeding to those blessed Apostles who were desired to commemorate the death of Christ in celebrating the mysteries of his law ; he is not a priest in his own right, for after Aaron there were many priests, but Christ as priest has no successor ; it is HE who changes the elements of bread and wine into his flesh and blood ; the priest who stands at the altar acts not in his own name, but in the name of Christ, whose “ minister and the dispenser “ of whose mysteries” he is ; hence he says in the name of

him "who appears before the face of God for us" *this is my body, this is my blood*, and Christ according to the institution being then made present as "a lamb that was dead "and yet lives," is *thereby* offered to the Father, as he incessantly offers himself in heaven. There is no new priesthood, there is no new sacrifice: By the *one oblation* sin was cancelled, and the high priest who was also the victim, having entered once into the holy of holies, lives always to intercede for us. He offers himself *there*, and by the agency of his ministers he is offered here on the earth, as often as he descends to feed us with the bread of life; not to make an atonement, which he has already plentifully made, but to apply this atonement to our souls by his intercession with the Father for us, being the only mediator between him and men.

Why we can believe that faith in him, that prayer, that baptism or any other sacred rite can apply the fruit of his death and passion to our souls, and not conceive, why the offering of his body and blood may not also be a means of giving thanks,—of rendering God propitious, or obtaining graces from him, is what I cannot comprehend: yet this is all is done at Mass; at Mass which *is a sacrifice*, for Christ is there presented, slain in figure by his word, which presents the body as it were distinct from the blood—*true* and *propitiatory*, because he is there offered for us to his Father whom he thereby renders propitious to his people. To conclude this long, and as some will say perhaps, irrelevant, digression into which my opponent has conducted me, I must advert to a quotation he adduces from the 3 B. 16 ch. of Pope Gelasius, de *Doc. Chr.*

And in the first place I may be permitted to inform my readers that Pope Gelasius never wrote a book or chapter entitled *de Doctrina Christiana*; The book so called was written by St. Augustine, and has in it no such passage as that cited; but we will not quarrel about mistakes to which every man is liable, and especially such theologians as I am doomed to reason with.

The passage objected is found in a book supposed by some to have been written by the above-named Pope against Eutyches the author of the heresy called after him, (as all heresies are called after those who first broached them,) but which book in the opinion of Baronius in his annals year 496, and of M. Cano in the 6th b. last ch. de loc. theol. is apocryphal. However admitting it; the author, like Chrysostom, Theodoret, and others of those times uses the words *substance* or *nature* (for the writer employs both, and one to explain the other *substantia vel natura* though my opponent quotes but one) they I say, use these words to signify the extent, limits, or other qualities of a body; thus Anastasius defines *φύσιν* or nature, as if it meant *μορφή των ὄντων*, that is, the form or quality of things existing: so Theodoret in various places; so St. Hilary can. x. in Math. writes, "*Corpus per fidem mortificatum in NATURAM animæ evadit*," the body mortified by faith puts on the *nature* of a Spirit; and St. Ambrose in Hexham. lib. 3, ch. 2, and again De Myst. cap. 9. writes *NATURAS fuisse mutatas quando a petra aqua fluxit, et Jordanis contra NATURAM reversus est in sui fontis exordium*. Hardouin de Sacr. cap. 3 and 4 adduces many other examples of this mode of speech. Thus it was that *substance* or *nature* were used, to signify qualities not essences, by the author of the book against Eutyches, in which the subject of the Eucharist is only introduced by way of illustration.

At that time the church was in quiet possession of the faith on this subject, and therefore her writers were less careful of the language they employed. Two things however are manifest, first, that the words quoted signified then as much what we call *qualities* as what we designate by the word *nature* or *substance*, and second, that the belief of the Church at that period was precisely the same it is now; whence the book must be either spurious, or the words were used in a sense consistent with the established faith.

To ascertain what this established faith then was we appeal to all the Fathers of that and the preceding age. To Augustine who says "Christ took flesh from the womb of a virgin and "walked in this flesh, and left us *this same flesh to eat, for our "salvation.*" "What we consecrate," says St. Ambrose, is "*the body which came forth from the Virgin.*" That which is in the chalice is that same which flowed from his side, and of it we partake, Chrys. Hom. 24 in Ep. 1 ad. Cor. I have selected these sentences for the sake of their brevity in preference to numberless others which shew the faith which then prevailed, and mindful that I have agreed to discuss with J. K. L's. opponent, not the doctrine of the Eucharist but something about Miracles. Observing also that this subject, as far as ancient authority is concerned, I had always considered as set at rest; the learned innovators from Luther down, having nearly all agreed, that the Fathers taught what we profess. We may convince however, but not persuade; or youth and ignorance may still presume to question what men of learning long since laid aside. It was said by some popular author, whose name I forget, "that nothing is more painful "to a generous mind, than to take favours from a hand it "scorns;" he had not experienced what I feel when arguing theology with but no, I drop the pen.

We have at length disposed of the Miracles, and have arrived at the *Church*, that Church on whose establishment this titular Bishop, as is supposed, has made so unmeasured an attack.

Doctor Doyle is, no doubt, a *titular* Bishop, and having looked into Johnson for the meaning of this word, I find by an example there quoted, that St. Augustine and the holy Valerius his predecessor were titular Bishops also. Doctor Doyle venerates, I understand, St. Augustine as a sort of Patriarch of his family, and is not I am confident, at all displeased to hold his See by the same tenure as the Prelate did whom he calls his holy Father; he has a *title* however and

possession, and these by the common law of the Church give a right to the exercise of spiritual jurisdiction, He asks no more! he is perfectly satisfied that Doctors Lindsey and Elrington should enjoy the temporalities of Kildare and Leighlin, whilst he is permitted in peace to exercise his spiritual rights; let them collect the fleeces whilst he superintends the flock. I believe it is the author of the "Com-
"plete Exposure" who calls Dr. Doyle the *titular—*
tolerated Bishop; he fears such an accumulation of epithets may oppress him, but will be satisfied to bear them—provided they do not annex *persecuted*, or oblige posterity to add it to his name.

I shall now proceed, not to the consideration, (for most of them are unworthy a serious thought) but merely to notice the charges preferred by this Champion of the Establishment against J. K. L's Vindication, and even against the character of the writer.

This friendly opponent of mine, to avenge my attack, as he calls it, on the establishment, represents me as an anarchist, and robber, and madman, in the hope of exciting the rabble to join him in the cry. He reckons I believe however without his host, and those who assail J. K. L. will scarcely induce any men of sense or reflection to suppose that he is a friend to disorder, to anarchy, or plunder.

If to advance and support by argument the position, "that the Legislature has a right even to diminish the present establishment of the Church, and that the interests
"of the country require their doing so," would prove me to be what this writer says I am, one consolation would remain to me, namely, that I should have many to share in my misfortune of every rank and religion in the British empire:

The ingenious author of the pamphlet "on the Consumption of Public Wealth by the Clergy" page, 4. states, that "those of the established Church in Eng-
"land and Ireland receive more money in the year

"than ALL THE CLERGYMEN OF ALL THE REST OF THE "WHOLE CHRISTIAN WORLD PUT TOGETHER," which assertion Doctor Laurence in his late charge, when noticing this pamphlet, does not deny nor disprove, though to do so would obviously serve his Grace's purpose, and the immediate object at which he laboured.

The Church property in Ireland is, without doubt, greater in proportion than in England, though the one is the richest, the other the poorest country in Europe, the condition of the people considered. This may serve our souls it is true, as "blessed are the poor," but we should like to see the maxim of the Apostle enforced for the sake of the clergy, "bear ye the burthens one of the other and so ye will fulfil the law of Christ." Their newly created advocate has, however, placed the parsons and prelates of the Church upon new ground, and makes their situation much resemble that of the Egyptian kings who possessed in property the entire of their dominions, letting them out to their subjects as tenants at will, for, "tell it not in Gath, publish it not in the streets of "Ascalon," all the inhabitants of this country, rich and poor, Protestant and Catholic, are THE TENANTS of the clergy.

I do not know how the Nobility and Gentry of Ireland may relish such a claim as this. I hope his Grace of Leinster who is so often quoted by my correspondent, will not become the tenant of a parson not many miles distant from his residence, who, some months ago, put DUCKS in pound for tythe or trespass I know not which, but the fact has been stated to me by a highly respectable gentleman of the town of Edenderry. Tenants of the clergy! Why heretofore every man who understood the constitutional laws of the country deemed the title of the clergy to tythe, a kind of lien or mortgage upon the land, but the idea of their having a direct dominion over it, such as a proprietor has who holds in fee, had not hitherto entered

into the public mind, but as I have said in my motto "*audivimus superbiam Moab, superbus est valde.*"

The Church seeks to alarm the Gentry for their possessions, should the establishment be interfered with.—Grattan understood this subject much better. Grattan who, like the pillar of light in the desert, guided all the true sons of Ireland, but threw a mist of darkness in the face of her enemies—that best of patriots and wisest amongst the men of his time—who saw almost by intuition the recesses of the Irish heart, and all the interests of his country, past, present, and for ages to come, saw no danger to the old titles from any improvement which could take place : on the contrary, he judged that improvements in the condition of the people could best secure those titles like every other social interest, because improvement alone could prevent tumult and insurrection. He observed in one of his most memorable speeches in the Parliament of the United Kingdom, that the purchases and settlements which had been made by the Catholics, the new interests which had been created in Ireland since the revolution, the whole frame and structure of society forbade the possibility of questioning the titles of those whom the Churchmen would now alarm.

The only danger he foresaw to Ireland was that of leaving her inhabitants oppressed and discontented—his maxim through life till the Union was, "the independence of Ireland and English connection." From 1800 till his death, he only wished and laboured to see the two countries united in interest and affection, and governed by equal laws. He knew his countrymen too well to suppose they had not understanding to see, that nature by the position of this Island seemed to have decreed that she should be united to the sister country, and that the cordial Union of both would render them the strongest and happiest empire in the world ; he knew the Irish too well to suppose they would ever prove ungrateful to the men who would bestow

upon them the blessings of the constitution, or to think they would continue to be distinct families, if they were all treated as children by their common Father.

But the Churchmen always disliked the views of Grattan, and could not comprehend his philosophy more than that of Burke, whose spirit from above would frown, could it hear them now quote his name to support their corrosive dominion !

This illustrious Irishman indeed eloquently described the advantages resulting to a monarchical or mixed government from a hierarchy and Church establishment ; but it is because these are good, that they should not be suffered to degenerate, so as to become a nuisance,—so as to eat up not only the property of the people but also of the aristocracy—those corinthian pillars of the social edifice which Burke so greatly and so justly admired.

Who born under a monarchy does not admire and venerate the kingly prerogatives? but behold the exercise of them by the Tudors and Stuarts—their blessed effects in the Star-chamber and dispensation-power ; and see whether even they may not become a curse, and produce those revolutions and catastrophes which they were created to prevent? It is an adage, “ *Corruptio optimi pessima* ” and in proportion, as a well regulated establishment in this country, (even in this country where the people do not belong to the Church) might be a blessing, so that establishment when it grows into a monstrous size, becomes a nuisance, and by its own weight tends to dissolution. It is superfluous to repeat what I have before written of our Establishment. If my remarks and arguments be not founded on facts or reason, they will not influence any person ; if they be, it is impossible that they will not be assented to by every disinterested man, by every man who will not be scared from consulting for the interests of his country by the bug-bears of anarchy and plunder, which the Churchmen, by a kind of pious fraud have endeavoured to cajole into their service.

But the Church establishment can not be reformed without the Church itself being destroyed ! This, indeed, is a strange language, when we consider the quarter from whence it proceeds. Had “a Papist, who lives “enslaved to a supposed infallible Church, and does “not seek either in the law of nature or the word “of God a reason for his opinions,” should he say so, his error might not surprise us ; but to hear this doctrine professed by men who believe that they have reformed not the establishment but the very Church of God, is what we were not prepared for—or is it that the ark is less sacred than the hides which cover it ? the doctrine and discipline less venerable than the fields and tithes ?

But to contend, as this writer does, that Church property cannot be applied entirely or in part to public purposes, is to contradict the history of every nation in Europe, and above all of our own. It is to question the titles of the Howards, the Fitzgeralds, the Russels, the Cavendishes, the Percys the Pettys, the Butlers, of almost all the historical families of both countries to a very valuable portion of their domains and rights. Such doctrine creates a suspicion that Thomas of Canterbury is to be again canonized, and Dowdall, of Armagh, or Plunkett, to become names as dear to the Church as those of Beresford or Knox. But the position is untenable, and those who have surrendered the right divine, will not succeed in identifying themselves with the proprietors of the soil, however they may usurp the sacred names of prescription or common law.

They were the proprietors of the country who founded the common law as well as the Church-establishment, and those proprietors who repeal or qualify by statute in every session that common law—which Blackstone describes as the result of positive enactments now lost or forgotten—they can undoubtedly modify and regulate all corporate properties according to the exigencies of public interest. Witness the events of Henry and Elizabeth’s reigns, and of that of

Edward VI. If public interests in Ireland do not require this modification, let the establishment remain untouched!

Or is not the Church property the property of a corporation? We know of no property but that of the Crown, of individuals or private property, and the property of corporations. The maxims of the Constitution, and several acts of Parliament teach us the nature of the first. Locke, on Legislation, gives a just idea of the second; he grounds it originally on the title of occupancy, consecrated by the sweat and labour of him who has the possession, and the law speaking the voice of nature and of the community, transmits it by the will of the occupant or otherwise, to his heirs. But corporate property is the *creature of the State essentially* set apart and vested in trustees for some specific end, conducive to the public good. The trustee is allowed, during his life, to appropriate a certain portion of it for the management of the entire, as well as for the other services which he is charged with, and engages to perform. And I know not, why our churchmen should have mistaken the nature of their property, unless, that having appropriated the *entire* to the total neglect of the fabric and the poor, and being so intent on amassing wealth as to forget their duties, they naturally enough began to consider themselves the proprietors of what they only *held in trust* for the community. But now that they have claimed a direct dominion over the soil and presumed to call the nation their *tenants*, I should not be surprised, if in the next session they had a bill introduced into Parliament, enabling them to devise by will what they hold as property; for I know of no property strictly such, unless, fiefs or the like *devised by law*, which might not be transmitted by settlement or will.

But the proprietors of the country are to be alarmed if they touch or reform that which they or their ancestors created, and which once blessed, but now blights their inhe-

ritance. What ! are the proprietors to be thus frightened from their propriety ? Are the men who hold the empire, with all its powers and resources in their own hands, are they to be alarmed because they remove from the shoulders of their own people, a burthen grown intolerable, or compel the land occupier, for instance to employ or feed the poor at the expense of the Church which cast them away.

And such a reformation as this would be alarming to the Duke of Leinster ! I doubt not his Grace thinks far otherwise. I have, myself, when residing in a Catholic country, seen two-thirds of the Church property therein, taken for the public service by a Catholic government, and tithes even in Spain have been taxed heavily by the state for nearly two centuries !

But my opponent will have such an establishment as may enable some of the clergy to withdraw from the cares of the world, and enjoying the "*otium cum dignitate*" devote their lives in retirement to the cultivation of the muses, to the charms of philosophy, or the black letter study of divinity and law. This is most harmonious, and he himself affords a striking specimen of this deep research and profound speculation ; I fear, however, our churchmen generally, will not imitate his bright example, and if we are to judge of their future progress in arts and science here with us, by what they have hitherto effected, we may suspect that too much wealth unsettles study, or enervates the mind ; or that these gentlemen prefer bustle to retirement, the pleasures of sense to dull theology or abstract pursuits. The reflection, however, savours much of popery, and would be an argument admirably suited to a monk, whose life is poor, and labour hard, drudging over rusted volumes in those retreats, where Plutarch, Virgil, Plato, Homer, Heroditus, hid themselves with the divine Chrysostom, Clement, Jerome and Augustine, from that storm of war and carnage, which laid waste the Roman empire, and caused in Europe a moral desolation. The

monk could claim for his venerable monastery which sheltered beneath its roof, the recluse, the stranger, and the poor ; which received into its hospitable hall, the prince, the prelate, and the warrior ; affording to virtue, religion, and learning, a safe retreat : *he* could claim the useful privilege of possessing wealth in common with his brethren. But we have heard his plea, and though Bede himself had spoken, we should have dismissed him with scorn ; nor will our churchmen now be heard, unless they propose, that medicine, law, and surgery with the numberless departments of the other arts and sciences, be also gifted with establishments. As Napoleon used to call us, we are in some sort, a nation of chapmen and dealers ; we give a price for all commodities, and a high one for theology : witness the sale of all our present lucubrations on the Miracles ! Should this public mart and competition be insufficient to stimulate the churchmen to exertion, they are the “*ignavum pecus*” and ought to be driven from the hive !

But tythes, forsooth, are a blessing to agriculture, for Sicily under their operation, became the granary of the empire, though only half as fertile as Egypt, yet she paid a fifth of all her produce. This is the argument of Bishop Woodward borrowed by Doctor Elrington, and copied by the man who for my sins (a monkish phrase) obliges me to write. In vain we have been told, when acquiring the rudiments of logic, that what proves too much proves nothing ; for is a proof which would lead us to fertilize the snows of Lapland by introducing blessed tenths and church domains, or treble the produce of Jamaica, by substituting for her present admirable Church establishment the heavenly dew of tythe. But no ! it is not error that my opponent deals in but sly sophistry, and that which he uses when detected is what we call “*non causa pro causa*,” the assigning as the cause of an effect what is not its cause at all.

He rallied me somewhere, because I seemed to attribute the rise and progress of arts, legislation, discoveries, and in-

ventions to the Catholic religion, though I did not do so, but only proved that this religion was perfectly compatible with their growth and perfection; but now, however, he forgets himself, and because Sicily, Egypt, and Ireland were, or have become abundant in corn, he would attribute their fertility to the tythe system—or perhaps I deal unjustly, he would have it that this system is no bar to their improvement.

The inundations of the Nile, and the laws of Egypt, the honour paid there to agriculture, in which the Kings themselves engaged, were not then sufficient to promote the growth of corn? The singular fertility of Sicily, and Ireland, contiguous to the capitals of two great empires, and deprived by circumstances of all other wealth—a vast population too, which should rest idle or be employed in the fields—the events of the last thirty years, during which the Baltic and Scheldt were generally closed against us, and the coasts of Barbary and America alone capable of supplying us with grain—the unprecedented consumption occasioned by the wars, and the multiplied means of reclaiming or cultivating lands produced by the paper-money—these, in the opinion of the Churchmen, were not sufficient causes for the encrease of agriculture, without the supernal benediction of tythe! Surely there are men who have eyes and see not, or who, as *Isaias* saith, “seeing, see not,” or we would not be offended with this silly sophistry. Let them, I pray, take this prescription of tythes to the Agricultural Committee of the House of Commons, should it be revived next session; it will save them the trouble of new modelling the corn laws, and if profusely administered, remove every vestige of agricultural distress—it will be a remedy not less efficacious for the relief of the farmer, than nervous excitement is for all the maladies of the human frame.

But no matter in what shape income is raised, or in what quantity, it all returns to those who pay it, as exhalations fall in dew—most delightful theory this, borrowed from

that modern political economy, which teaches that taxation is a blessing, which may be infinitely increased without injuring society. I leave such a paradox to the wise inventors of it, and believe those abatements made in rent, by the wisdom or humanity of landlords throughout the empire, prove sufficiently that if the means of the agriculturist be forced beyond a certain limit, they yield to the tension, and leave the land barren, the tenant a pauper, and the proprietor indigent or embarrassed.

But it is objected, "if the tenant be exempted from tythe "the landlord alone will profit." I do not pretend to say from what cause it arises, but it so is in Ireland, that the tenants in every instance with which I ever happened to be acquainted, prefer dealing with the landlord rather than with the parson. The uniform impression on their mind is, that they get the land from the landlord for the rent, but that they get *nothing* for the tythe. And not all the Divines or Lawyers in the kingdom (and we are well supplied with both professions) could induce them to believe, that there is any natural obligation on their part to pay tythe, whilst their entire care and anxiety is, to *make up* and *pay the rent*; and though in such a community as the Irish now-a-days form, there must be many unprincipled and dishonest amongst them, yet with these exceptions, they are as strictly just in fulfilling the covenants of their leases *on conscientious principles*, as any men could possibly be. But having made this observation, which cannot well be deemed irrelevant, I may be allowed to observe—from the acute and powerful Grattan in his speech on tythes, that the landlord has a rent reserved which is uniform, and contemplates rather the natural value of the soil he lets, than the capital, skill, and industry to be employed upon it; these latter are the produce of the man's labour or money and do not yield an annual encrease in the ecclesiastical sense, and yet they are taxed most heavily by the Parson—I say most heavily, for three-fourths, in some places nine-tenths of the produce

of land, is owing to the labour, skill, and capital employed upon it. These three-fourths then, or nine-tenths as they may be, would not be contemplated by the landlord, and should not, but they are ALL assessed by the Proctor, and devoted to the tender mercies of the Church. Who then will say that it is a matter of indifference to the tenant whether he pay the Landlord or the Parson?

But a passage from the speech of my Lord Maryboro' is quoted, a Nobleman whom J. K. L. should not mention without acknowledging the obligations he owes to his Lordship, for whom, as well as for the Illustrious Head of the house of Wellesley, he feels *unaffectedly* the warmest gratitude as well as the most profound veneration; This passage is quoted, to shew that there is an excess in the rent of land exempt from tythe, over the charge to which tythe (were it subject to it) would make such land liable. To draw a general conclusion from a particular fact is contrary to all the rules of right reason, and though the fact mentioned by his Lordship must on his authority be true, it only proves *a single case*, and against which numberless others could be quoted. I shall instance one, and as the word of an anonymous writer can have but little weight, I will presume on the indulgence of a gentleman, with whom I have the honor of being acquainted—a member of the last and of a preceding Parliament, to mention his name as a proof of what I state.

Cæsar Colclough Esq. of Tintern Abbey holds in full property all his Abbey lands. The tythes and the soil alike belong to him. These lands may be from eight to twelve or fourteen thousand acres, and they are all let by himself or his ancestors lower at an average, as far as I am acquainted, than any other lands though subject to tythe in the county where he dwells, and which he adorns by his public and private virtues. This case, it is true, proves no rule, I am well aware of that, but neither does the other cited by my Lord Maryboro', and it is not as I conceive

the ordinary course of nature that a simple letting of land by one who contemplates the land alone, could be as burdensome to the tenant, as where it is not only set by the man whose property it is, but also taxed by one who gathers from its surface the tenth of all its fruits—the fruits of sweat and toil, of care and watching! And which tax has not unfrequently and even in cases within the writer's own knowledge caused the farmer to leave the hay to rot, rather than cut it and pay tythe!

But supposing I should even concede to my opponent, all the value he attaches to Lord Maryborough's argument, still I think if this were the place for a more extended examination of the question than I have leisure to bestow on it, it might without much difficulty be proved, that the annihilation of tithe universally, would have the effect of lowering rents universally. I shall leave this position without a proof at present, for to men who know the subject somewhat better than my conceited opponents, (who, it appears, cannot even comprehend the principle) a discussion would be superfluous.

My opponent accuses me of inconsistency for speaking at one time of the overgrown wealth of the Clergy, and at another representing them as needy, "unfit to hold the place of gentry." Does he wish I should state what cannot be calculated because studiously concealed, to wit the value of the Irish Sees,—of the Glebes, some of which contain several hundred acres,—of tythes of certain unions or pluralities, in order to prove this the first assertion—or would he oblige me to refer the public to Doctors' Commons or the Prerogative Court to number up the hundreds of thousands, if they do not exceed a million, bequeathed by those Irish Prelates who died within the last few years; or again, does he require that I should exhibit the indigent Vicar, or wretched Curate, subsisting with his family on some seventy pounds a year! This trouble would explain my apparent inconsistency, but would not

be very creditable to those who minister in this gorgeous temple. But J. K. L. is taunted as if he desired the tythes for himself, or is jeered on account of his poverty. He assures his opponent, that if with the Apostle he might not know how to abound, he knows at least how to suffer want, to which his habits of life (thanks to God) have inured him ; and if he has not inherited from his ancestors more property than most of the Clergy of the Establishment, it was owing to the operation of the penal laws, so late as in the life-time of his father, for even then these laws were sending some of the best blood of Ireland to join, as Swift well expressed it, the ranks of the coal-porters. Many of us can say with Francis the First, after the defeat at Padua, “we have lost all but our honour,” or feel with Juvenal, “*Nil fœdus habet paupertas quam quod homines ridiculos facit !*”

But “I calumniate the Clergy by attributing to their “agents cruelty and oppression.” With all due deference to the tribe of Proctors, a race less worthy than those who traverse the fields of battle to despoil the dead, I only collected in my assertion what is notorious to every man, woman, and child in Ireland, who can read, hear, and understand !

I believe I might collect the remaining subjects touched on by the author of the “Observations,” under the following heads, his panegyric on the English Liturgy,—his censure of our use of the Latin language in the celebration of the holy mysteries,—his *querre* respecting the extent of my principles of toleration,—an effort to reconcile the doctrines of authority and latitudinarianism in the Established Church, and a weak attempt to misrepresent our discipline on the subject of reading the Scriptures. There may be some minor matters which have escaped me, as it is not at all times the composition before me arrests the attention.

My observations on all the above subjects will be exceed-

ing short, first as they are irrelevant to the matters or arguments which compose my Vindication, and secondly, because a lengthened discussion of them would have the effect of forcing upon me some new controversies, for which I have little inclination and still less time—time the want of which we all complain of, from the author of the “Complete Exposure,” to the Classic E. Barton. He who like a Raphael throws on all he touches such light and grace; whose charming work shot up amidst the dreary winter of our disputes and cavills, like the naked flower which springs from earth when snow and frost are scarcely thawed, and cheers the mind! His piety, his philosophy, his whole demeanor bespoke so much the Christian and the sage! But stop! a stupid elf or bigot would almost catch the inspiration from him and rhapsodize!

To return to my less courteous correspondent. His praise of the English Liturgy reminds me of the *Moricæ Encomium*, or panegyric on folly, of Erasmus, which I often read; yes the profane Rogue, (I borrow the word “Rogue” not from the legend “Irish Rogues and Rapparees,” but from my accomplished opponent,) J. K. L. sometimes does take up Erasmus, as a desert after a full meal of the Evangelical Magazine, or of the Report of the Bible Society, or of the Society for converting the Africans or Jews, or the Proceedings of some meeting connected with these hallowed institutions, such as that for enlightening our benighted generation with *Irish Bibles*! After such satiety as these repasts afford, a chapter from Erasmus or Savedra has as salutary an effect on J. K. L. as a goblet of Champagne after a choice Haunch of Venison would have on an overgrown Dignitary of any Church or State.

My correspondent’s encomium on the Liturgy only shews that he can praise what is really praise-worthy; had he exercised his ingenuity in praising something like folly as Erasmus did, he would bequeath a better legacy to posterity; or if he only wished to display his powers he should, like Doctor Johnson, take the wrong

side of some question, for J. K. L. had praised, not censured, the Established Liturgy, and assigned in a pithy line his reason for doing so. It is *that reason* I believe which excited the newly acquired orthodoxy of my correspondent, and caused him to slip into a discussion respecting those who framed the Creed and Liturgy of the Church of England when she was *first radically reformed*. It is entirely foreign to my purpose to treat of these men, or of the means they used, of what they effected, or of the authority on which they proceeded: a thousand volumes have been written on these subjects. Bossuet in one or two books of his *Variations* has collected and condensed more relating to them than I ever could; to his works I would beg to refer my correspondent for what I neither can nor wish to say. If however it be admitted that these *founders* had recourse to the ancient Liturgies and Fathers for evidence of the truth, let us not in future be taunted with our love of tradition, or with the all-sufficiency of the Written Word. Let it be candidly allowed, that without the testimony of the Church, the *Written Word* is not sufficient—either to vindicate the Christian observances, or determine disputes; that it is mute and silent like every other law, and requires that the “*dicta*” of the sages who administered it to the people, should have been treasured up, (as Blackstone says of our common law,) otherwise that the sense of it never could be ascertained, nor the disputes arising out of it ever terminated. To seek to settle these disputes by a kind of coquetry such as this writer assigns to the Church of England in treating with the Dissenters, saying “ah, won’t you stay with your mother—ah, don’t go from her, or you will repent it.” This is worse than ludicrous, when applied to the Kingdom of Christ, and the City of the living God—to which the sword of the Spirit was given—to correct the froward, punish the turbulent, and cast out or cut off the refractory. Is it not silly to speak or write thus, after hearing Christ say that he who would not hear the Church should be treated as a

heathen and publican—after reading what St. John, St. Paul and St. Jude say of those who broach heresies or resist authority—after reading the Acts of the Councils of Jerusalem, Nice, Constantinople, Chalcedon—after, in fine, hearing the Anathemas which Calvinism in the Synods of Charenton and Dordrecht, the Lutherans in all their confessions, the Church of England in her Articles, pronounce against all those who profess or believe that “every one can obtain salvation in his own *sect*, provided he seek to square his life by the precepts of the Gospel, as taught by it or in it.” This in good truth is like to folly or deceit in any Christian and still more so in a man who professes to be a Minister of the Established Church—to admire her Liturgy, and who has called God and Heaven to witness that he believes her articles.

Doctor Hoadly and those who follow him were wiser and took a safer refuge in Latitudinarianism, disposing of the National Creed by saying, *as is every day said and believed*, that a *silent* reformation has taken place in the Established Church, *and that time has abated of the rigour of her ancient tenets*.

Let, therefore, authority and tradition be admitted, or let Latitudinarianism with all the other *sects*, and *sectaries* prevail; and the Church, as she cannot longer retain her children by power, (which it is impossible to preserve or reconcile with the right of private judgment,) let her, I say, follow them in their aberrations, and found a Creed for them so vague—so indifferent as to embrace (if it be possible to embrace) them all; but let us not be goaded with insult, and annoyed with the folly of those, who by their declamation, and impositions, and calumnies, keep the enlightened and admirable race of men who in this country are still attached to the frame and name of the Establishment under an influence the most dangerous to their spiritual welfare, to which any community of Christians, naturally so good and virtuous, ever were subjected. I do not here dispute whether the right of private judgment be or be not consistent with the

Gospel, but I do contend that it is incompatible with Church authority.

As to the extent of J. K. L.'s principles of toleration. This writer being pleased to identify him with Doctor Doyle, might find a reply to his *quære* in the address of the latter, on the subject of illegal associations, if my explanation be too Jesuitical or obscure; But to save my correspondent trouble I shall state, that, I include as belonging to the Church, not only children, idiots, and madmen, but all those, who, not having themselves adopted error, but imbibed it from their ancestors—seek earnestly to discover truth, and are ready on finding it to stand corrected. All such, if baptized, belong unquestionably to the Church, though in external communion they are without her pale, and their errors are not, in our opinion, so great an obstacle to their salvation, as the want of sacraments and other aids, of which by their situation they are deprived.

That Doctor Magee and J. K. L.'s correspondent, however united in language, in sentiment, and hostility to the Romanists, may yet be of this class of our brethren is the most sincere wish of my heart; as I am well satisfied “that in the measure I mete to them, the Lord in his mercy “will measure to myself.”

As to the notes which this writer affixes to the Church of God, namely “my sheep hear my voice,” and “our “loving one another,” they are marks as uncertain as the professions of mankind are doubtful or insincere. If we ourselves be credited, we all hear the voice of God, one from under a stone where he seeks the deity,—another from the brawling, canting Methodist,—a third from the Bible or the Hymn-Book,—a fourth from his own conscience,—a fifth from those of whom it was said, “HE WHO HEARS YOU HEARS “ME.” And if loving one another were a certain sign of the Church, who does not do so, if his own word be believed? And *who does so* if his works be made the criterion of his charity? But not even works, though by them “we

“gave all our substance to the poor, or delivered up our bodies so as to be burned,” would prove, that we loved each other in Christ and for his sake. It is only “the union of spirit in the bond of peace,” which shews where true charity resides; and certainly we Catholics are more of *one mind*, and have in our head or centre of union a more powerful bond to unite us, than any others who profess the name of Christ.

The summary of the Christian faith, as Rufinus tells us, was composed by the Apostles, it was enlarged at Nice, and completed, with the exception of the word “*filiogue*,” at Constantinople. This is admitted by us all, and this Creed teaches, that the Church in which we believe, is One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic: these marks no doubt are old, they may not be suited to the taste of modern times; but we who are theologians of the old school, not prepared as yet to become disciples of my profound opponent, or to embrace, contrary to the admonition of St. Paul to Timothy, *profane novelties*, will not exchange these old marks of the Church of God, for any new ones which his fancy or interest may lead him to adopt.

I believe it is whilst describing the plastic character of the Church of England that this writer said, “she did nothing in anger, or haste, and was therefore pleasingly contrasted with the other new establishments.”

Why this Gentleman, in his study of rhetoric has entirely forgotten history, and supposes that we are all as ignorant as he is forgetful—that the events which occurred from the middle of the reign of Henry, to the expulsion of James—that the lives of all the Prelates, from Cranmer to Laud, or even to Tillotson, are unknown to us.

I cannot conceive what purpose can be served by putting forth to the public such assertions as these, which are not only groundless but contrary to what is as well known

as the names of Tyburn or Charing-Cross. Will these Churchmen never cease deluding the world?

But hush! if you combat sects and heresies, the infidels will oppose to you (says this writer) the various denominations of Christians, and laugh at your claim to infallibility. The reply to this observation is as old-fashioned as the dress of Queen Anne—it is, that when treating with infidels we have arguments sufficient to prove the divinity of our religion; but when reasoning with men who profess to believe in Christ as the Redeemer of Mankind, we have recourse to the Church as to the very head and front of his institution; and until the question of her rights is settled, it is through mere courtesy we dispute on any other.

The name of sect or heresy is so foreign from the idea of Christian unity,—so incompatible with the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church, (the belief in which the Apostles in the Creed placed next after the belief in the Trinity and Incarnation,) that we cannot recognise in those who do not *prove themselves to believe in her*, any right to question her doctrines. This theology is indeed as old as Tertullian. Let these persons not disturb us, therefore, with similes about Solomon and his women, for a simile may illustrate, but can never prove a contested position, as every thing, however absurd, can find a likeness in nature.

Did Catholics say with the Apostle, that the handmaid and her child, ejected by Abraham, and not suffered to inherit with Sarah and Isaac, were perfect models of the sects which by baptism bring forth children to the Church, but who have no share in the inheritance; did we rest our doctrine on these or such allegories, though warranted by the interpretation of the Apostle in a case nearly parallel, we should be deemed and justly, both silly and contemptible. But no! our truths are like the rock, over which the surge passes angrily, but unheed-

ed—they are strong, though naked, and need no such support.

This writer is dissatisfied with the discipline of our Church, as expounded by me respecting the use of the sacred Scriptures. If it were in my power to meet his views, I must be disposed to do so, in order to furnish at least one point of coincidence for our opinions, but if Plato, (the name is too respectable) be a friend, truth is still more so. Let the Church of England continue to propound a creed, and pronounce anathema against those who believe that salvation can be had in any sect, and yet tell her children that every man of sound judgment may understand the Bible as he listeth; let her do so, and labour to reconcile such inconsistency; whilst ours prescribes from the word of God the rule of faith, and obliges every member of her communion to adopt that meaning of the Bible which from the beginning, she has assigned to it.

Human pride and petulance may repine and say, that faith like chemistry, might be improved by experiments; but we will believe, notwithstanding, that it admits neither of diminution nor increase, and was just as perfect when first established as at this hour however sects may have served to unfold its tenets or caused them to be published in councils or decrees. This faith may be good or bad with us, but if bad, the fault is not ours, but His who promised to be with us to the end, “Lo, I am with you to the end of the world.” If his spirit has suffered the Church to err, we err with God, or our malice has forced him to withdraw and break his promise before the consummation came.

His children know and read the Scriptures, and require no teacher but himself, who dwells amongst them—speaking by the thousand tongues of ministers who proclaim *his* truths, but not their own opinions—or his sweetest unction like the dew of heaven distilled upon the heart, teacheth of itself interiorly, and lifts the soul by lights till then un-

seen into the regions of bliss, and to the very throne of God. Prayer, contemplation, rapture, extacy thus ascend, whilst the soul mounts by these degrees, as angels by a ladder, until she prophecies, or hears such words, like Paul, as man is not permitted to express. Perhaps she faints or languishes with love in the long-desired embrace of her heavenly spouse. Spirit herself, and spiritualized by grace, she understands all things ; her wisdom is folly to the carnal man who knoweth not what the Spirit teacheth in the Church where he abides. It is thus that all Scripture is useful to teach, reprove, instruct from infancy to age, and makes men perfect in the ways of God. O Jacob, how beautiful are thy tents, and Israel, how delightful are thy tabernacles ! marching in the desert with Moses at thy head, and all thy tribes arranged behind their standards, perfect in parts and all perfect together, until you reach the long expected land ; until the Church, of which thou wert the figure, quits this desert earth and enters heaven.

The patriotism of my opponent is aroused when he reflects on the crowds of his countrymen who worship in the open air, far removed from the altar where the victim of propitiation is offered for their sins. Perhaps should this feeling become general, we may expect some public aid to assist us in building chapels for these benighted souls, who thus from the banks of rivers, like the Israelites of old, address their prayers to heaven.

I have read of men in Parliament, when labouring to obtain grants to build churches in Ireland, (a work in truth of no great difficulty) and who were reported to have said, that if the churches were once erected, the congregations would grow up of themselves ; but here, according to my correspondent, we have the congregations ready formed, if we only had the churches.

The argument used by this writer against our clergy for not instructing their flocks in the chapels, especially in the

north and west of Ireland, is very like the reproach we have long endured, of not educating the people either against law, or if not against law, without houses or schoolmasters, or books ; but of this subject I treated in my *Vindication*, *Ye sons of men how long will ye be dull of heart, or why do ye love iniquity and seek after a lie?*

But these benighted people “ who prepare to get drunk “ by getting Mass, imagine they partake of the fruits “ of this Mass as much as if they were immediately present “ at it.” I can inform my correspondent that this is not only their opinion, but also mine, all my Bible reading for twenty years and upwards notwithstanding ! It is true that I am of that old school which knows as little of *modern* theology as Copernicus or Tycho Brahe knew of Newton’s system of attraction. But so it is in our old school.

Believing that in the Mass, Christ is present, and offers himself to his Father for his children, lest they should have sinned like those of Job, it is our belief, that all those who assist at this offering in mind and spirit and are of the assembly for which it is presented before the face of God, do partake of the graces and mercies which are then obtained ; nor is there to be found in the vast assemblage which my correspondent describes, any person above the condition of a child or an idiot, who does not believe exactly the same on this subject as what is here explained—so thoroughly does this Catholic doctrine permeate even the dense forest of Irish stupidity and ignorance.

If these people afterwards get drunk *that* is the fruit of the semi-barbarism to which the penal laws, not the Catholic religion reduced them. Religious instruction by the Clergyman might correct, if not amend the vicious effects of these laws, but if Paul or Barnabas happened to be in the hut called a Chapel, how could they instruct unto righteousness those who could not approach to hear them ? But it is in vain to reason with the faction or their organs ; they have closed their eyes and “ hardened their faces more than

“the rock” against the poor of this afflicted country, against their religion and their priesthood.

“But we use a liturgy in an unknown tongue contrary “to the command of the Apostle.” So do the Cophts, the Scythians, the Greeks, the Armenians, for though in all these countries like in Rome, the liturgies were originally composed in the vernacular language, yet when that language changed, as it has changed in every country in the lapse of ages, it was thought proper to retain the ancient form of liturgy for the purpose of preserving uniformity in the public worship, and excluding those vicissitudes and changes to which living languages are always liable. If such caution be necessary in the forms of records, and even in the characters in which they are written, that errors and uncertainty may be excluded, how much more are they required in those liturgies which are the records of the faith of the several churches, as well as the forms of their prayer and worship. Had a liturgy been composed for England at the time of Canute or William the Conqueror, it should since then, have been frequently altered, and in being altered its style and words might be changed in sense and substance.

The meaning and signs of every living language are daily fluctuating, but those of languages called dead, are fixed and uniform, and hence these latter are preferred for every purpose of a public and important nature. Our Church is attached to uniformity and consistency, her children of different tongues are all but one family, and it is fitting that they should have for their common service a common language—one, and unchanged!

As to the inconvenience arising to the people who do not understand the Latin tongue, it is small indeed, when we consider that every book almost of common prayer has the order of the Mass or liturgy translated, as well as prayers adapted to every part of the sacrifice from the com-

mencement to the end. The people then, whether within or without the temple, all join the Priest in word, or at least in spirit; and the Gospel or Epistle which contains the special instruction for the day, he who officiates is commanded by the Council of Trent, Sess. 5, de Ref. c. 2. to expound on each Sunday and festival to the congregation. Amongst our people there may be often a want of religious instruction though much less than is supposed, if J. K. L. be well informed; but this want arises not from a defect in our liturgy, or from the language in which it is written, but from other causes, one of which, perhaps the principal, is, the state of our places of worship; which the legislature, it is hoped, may yet take into consideration.

But “the use of the Latin language in the celebration of Mass is contrary to the express word of God.”

If it be thus that my correspondent interprets that word, I would recommend him to become again even blindly enslaved to some ecclesiastical authority, that he might take any judgment rather than his own of the meaning of sacred writ.

The word of God to which he alludes, is found in 1 Cor. xiv. ch. where St. Paul treats of the gift of tongues then common in the Church, and continued to the time of Iræneus as that Father testifies. The Blessed Apostle, after announcing that the gift of prophecy is preferable to that of speaking with divers tongues, proceeds v. 6, to say, “If I come to you speaking with tongues what shall I profit you, unless I speak to you either in revelation, “or in knowledge, or in prophecy, or in doctrine,” and having explained the inutility of speaking in different languages, unless what is spoken regard those things just enumerated, he, by a simile taken from a harp or trumpet, which if not modulated is useless, concludes the subject thus: “If I know not the power of the voice,” that is the sense of what is spoken, “I shall be to him, to whom

“I speak, a barbarian, and he that speaketh a barbarian to me.”

The whole scope and object of the Apostle in the entire passage, is to teach the Corinthians the inutility of supernatural gifts, if they be not well employed, and to prevent the new christians from being ambitious of excellency in them, hence he adds, “forasmuch as ye are zealous of spirits, seek to abound (in them) to the edifying of the Church.”

To draw an argument from this passage against the use of the Latin language at Mass resembles that other, equally conclusive, adduced by my opponent from Solomon and the litigious women, to prove the marks of the true Church; but to pronounce from his allegorical exposition of a text that “our practice is directly opposed to the word of God” is what only a special inspiration (with which, perhaps, he may be gifted) could authorize him to do. We theologians of the *old school* are not accustomed to reason so, and whilst we think with the Apostle that the gift of speaking with various tongues is estimable only when the things spoken are instructive or edifying, we are very far from thinking that our liturgy is either unknown in words or doubtful in sense to those who daily read it translated in their books of prayer, or who are taught the meaning of it. If we be barbarians, as we are not unfrequently called, certainly we are not rendered so by not understanding our liturgy, or the nature, rites, or ceremonies of the Mass.

I now take leave of my opponent, *and for the last time*. He, I understand, is young, and youth is rash and self-sufficient; if J. K. L. be Doctor Doyle, he could with some propriety admonish his correspondent to leave these subjects to the more experienced. He would not say to him “*ne ultra crepidam sutor*”—he would rather remind him, that even much knowledge puffeth up, but a little of it is a dangerous thing “*obiter degustata*” says the wise Bacon, “*abducit a Deo, penitus hausta reducit ad eundem*.” Let

him attend to his duties, and perhaps the Almighty in his good time may enable him to exercise his talents, (which for a young man are not contemptible,) to some useful purpose.

To the public I have to apologize for obtruding myself upon their notice; but when I see not only myself maligned or misrepresented (for that I could overlook) but my country and religion traduced or defamed, I am forced to lay aside personal considerations, rather than suffer pride, arrogance, and a spirit of oppression to bear down or overwhelm what is more dear to me than life.

When I had written thus far, "the Case of the Church of Ireland," as stated by Declan reached me. To compare it with the work of Molyneux, which its title brings to our recollection, would not be just; in style and method there may be some faint resemblance; in deep research, in a profound knowledge of his subject, in close and perspicuous reasoning, accompanied with good faith and a total absence of offensive expressions, the similarity does not hold. But "he nobly fails, who fails in great attempts," and if Declan has not reached the eminence of his prototype, he has left far behind him the humble assistants who laboured with him in a "Case" which is manifestly a difficult one.

I can easily excuse his occasional warmth, satisfied that it only burned on the surface, and as to his rebukes of J. K. L. and the imputations which he labours to affix to him, they were a portion of the task he undertook; they are the feelings of the dignified client, not the genuine production of the mind or heart of the advocate. If they be sins, they are the sins of a man, yielding to a powerful influence, and deserve that a tear should be dropped on them and they blotted out for ever.

But whilst I acquit Declan, who has rightly changed his name and his religious profession before he would appear in public, as the advocate of a system hostile to Ireland and to the Creed of his fathers—whilst I acquit him

of all personal hostility to the civil and religious principles of the Irish Catholics, it is but just that I should observe upon the pleadings by which he endeavours to support his "Case," and justify my own opinions, so far as they are affected by his remarks.

Several passages of the foregoing sheets contain principles or reflections applicable to some of the remarks of Declan, and which it will be therefore unnecessary to obtrude a second time upon the reader. The disquisition respecting St. Patrick is a sort of after-piece to his "Case." It is probably the production of one of those leisure hours, which the writer when in College used to devote to antiquarian researches; and were he disposed to favour the literary world with others of them, it is likely we would no longer hesitate to determine the birth-place of Homer, or the name of him to whom we are indebted for the discovery of the art of Printing.

When Usher, Milner, Lanigan and O'Connor have failed to satisfy Declan as to whether St. Patrick ever saw the face of Pope Celestine, it is not at all probable, that I, who am no great proficient in such studies as theirs, could succeed in unravelling to his satisfaction so intricate a question. At present he does not appear to be quite decided in his dissent from the accurate and truth-loving Ledwich; probably my weak efforts to convince him might serve rather to augment his doubts, should doubt still linger in his mind, of our Apostle's existence. Let him, however, cast his eye once more over the valuable work of Doctor Lanigan, a work which for extensive knowledge, deep research, and accurate criticism, surpasses in my opinion all that has ever been produced by the Established Church collectively or individually in Ireland, Usher's labours only excepted. Let him peruse this work once more, and unless he is too much occupied with the legend about his namesake St. Declan, (of whom it was predicted at his birth, that he

would one day *be a great man*,) he may be induced to change his opinion as to the mission of St. Patrick.

Doctor Lanigan should satisfy him that after the return of S.S. Germans and Lupus from Britain, where as delegates of the Holy See, they had come to suppress the Pelagian heresy, St. Patrick abode with the former at Auxerre, —that he was sent by him in company with the Priest Sigetius to Pope Celestine, and recommended as a person well adapted for the mission to Ireland.

The conversion of this country occupied at that time the attention of his Holiness; and Germanus from his proximity to Ireland, his late journey to Britain, and his high station in the Church of Gaul, as well as his knowledge of the qualifications of Patrick, was eminently qualified to furnish information, and recommend missionaries for the pious enterprize. If Probus, then, and the Scholiast on the Hymn of St. Fiech, as well as all the writers of the life of St. Patrick, were as silent on the subject of this journey of our Apostle to Rome, as they are express and unanimous in their mention of it, yet it should be admitted on the authority of Erric in his life of St. Germanus, lib. 1, ch. 12. This writer is one of unimpeachable character, and relates it only as a part of his narrative, without other design, interest, or end, than that of giving an account of whatever was interesting in the life of the holy Bishop of Auxerre.

Did the discrepancies which occur in the relations of other writers, who have recorded similar facts, though with different dates, or varying circumstances, invalidate their testimony, we should reject as spurious and apocryphal the most important historical events, and amongst the rest many passages of the Gospels in which the Evangelists seem to contradict each other.

The silence of Prosper is indeed a negative argument, but when I learned Logic, I was taught, with the other rules of criticism, that such an argument should not outweigh direct, credible, and positive testimony, even

though no reason could be assigned for the silence of a writer, and I recollect the example furnished by my master, was the argument deduced from the silence of cotemporary writers, respecting the Evangelist John having been cast into a chaldron of boiling oil, before the Latin gate by order of Domitian, and escaping unhurt; and which, nevertheless, as I was instructed, should be admitted on the single positive testimony of Tertullian,—a credible witness writing on the subject, and which testimony is recorded by St. Jerome.

Prosper is said to have been private secretary to the Popes, during the greater part of his stay at Rome, and the admirable documents which emanated from that See against the Pelagian, and Nestorian, and even Eutychean Heresy are attributed chiefly to his pen. His Chronicle is a brief register of the principal occurrences of this time, and amongst the rest he mentions the commission to preach the Gospel in Ireland, given by Pope Celestine to Paladius. It was enough for the purpose of Prosper to mention this mission and the person to whom it was confided. The details of it were not within his province, nor did it belong to him to enumerate the fellow-labourers of Paladius, of whom Patrick, on the recommendation of Germanus was one. Doctor Lanigan shews with great justice and truth, how Paladius died when his labours in Ireland had scarcely begun—and that St. Patrick, on his way from Rome, after he had stopped some time with his Patron at Auxerre, and visited his friends for the last time, having heard of the demise of his Principal, was, in virtue of the commission he had received, consecrated Bishop in a certain part of Gaul, and so proceeded to the scene of his Apostolic labours. It is not from Prosper we could expect to learn those particulars; they were facts with which he could be but imperfectly acquainted, and which it concerned him in no wise to record.

How silly and impertinent the man would appear, who

would question the mission of Augustine to England, because the historian who mentioned it had omitted to give the names of the Monks who accompanied him ; or who would say that certain assistants did not accompany him, because their names were not transmitted to us by an eminent writer who kept a journal of the events of Pope Gregory's Pontificate.

Since regular missions were first sent from the great Patriarchal Sees, they were uniformly composed of several individuals, one of them generally a Bishop ; and when sent to distant countries, or to countries to which access was difficult, in early times these Bishops were commissioned to erect new Bishoprics when necessary, and consecrate Prelates according as the exigencies of the new Church might require ; and their assistants would be badly enabled to carry on the work of conversion if the death of their principal put an end to their jurisdiction.

It is not in so slovenly a manner that the See of Rome, rendered wise by experience in the sacred duty of propagating the Faith, has proceeded. She could not fail to enable the companions of Palladius, of whom Patrick was the chief, to continue the labours she had commissioned them to execute, and though it would be contrary to her custom to consecrate two Bishops at the same period for the same Church, it would be a dereliction of her duty not to enable those whom she sent to supply the wants which time or the success of their ministry might create, and that too at a period when recourse to her was difficult, and should be attended with inconvenience and delay.

What probably may appear more surprising to Declan is, that at different times, but especially when many nations and tribes remained to be converted, every Catholic Bishop in communion with the See of Rome, had a power to depute Missionaries to labour at the conversion of infidels, or to attend colonies emigrating from the country in which such Bishop resided ; because, as St. Cyprian happily expresses himself of the Catholic Church, "the Episcopacy is *one*, a part of the entire of which is held by each Bishop."

Episcopatus unus est cujus in solidum pars a singulis tenatur ; but whether they possessed such power by the tacit consent of the head of the Church, or by inherent right, until restricted, it has never occurred to any of them that such missionaries were independent of the Holy See, or were not obliged to have recourse to her, for the purpose of giving form and consistency to the Churches which they might establish. Every Catholic in the universe ever has, and ever will repeat with St. Jerome, “ I despise Meletius, I ignore “ Paulinus; whosoever does not gather with you (he is writing “ to Pope Damasus) scatters; I am united in communion “ with your Holiness, that is with the Chair of Peter, “ upon which I know the Church is built; whosoever will “ eat the lamb out of this house is profane.”

Without, therefore, undertaking to compose the mighty disputes between the venerable antiquarians, amongst whom Declan's name may be henceforth enrolled, I will simply assure him, that the fact of St. Patrick receiving his mission to preach the Gospel in Ireland, is as certain as that he came here, “ for how could he preach,” as St. Paul has it, “ unless he were sent;” and moreover, that whether he were sent immediately by Celestine or by St. Germanus, whom Prosper himself presents to us as a delegate or legate of the Holy See, is a matter of no kind of importance.

I doubt much whether a power to exercise civil or military jurisdiction, emanating in Ireland from the Chief Governor for the time being, be less valid or legal than if it were imparted by the Sovereign himself; or whether the decrees of Doctor Radcliffe in the Prerogative Court, be less binding than if they were signed and executed by the Patron of Declan, in whose name, and by whose authority they are issued.

If this gentleman be as well versed in the history and discipline of the Church as he is partial to the lives of the Saints, he must know, that beyond all controversy the Popes of Rome have always, and by all historians, not even excepting the fanciful Mosheim or Illyricus and his learned associates of Magdeburgh, been recognized as the Pa-

triarchs of the West, and as such enjoyed, not an honorary pre-eminence, but a rightful jurisdiction over all the Churches in this part of our hemisphere.

In early times, as well before the Church enjoyed an entire liberty under Constantine, as after the empire was dissevered by the barbarians, the Popes were obliged to confide extensive powers to the Bishops of certain Sees—that the work of conversion might not be retarded—Churches remain widowed—discipline become relaxed—or heresy prevail with impunity; and such delegation of power accounts satisfactorily for the absence of that constant and intimate intercourse between Rome and the more distant Churches which happily prevails in those later times. But such delegated powers were, in almost every instance, revocable at the will of the Pope, or limited to the lifetime of the person to whom they were entrusted. They were frequently confided, now to the Bishop of one See, now to the Prelate of another, and the jealousies and disputes on this subject which so often troubled the Churches of Gaul, of the north of Italy, of Illyricum and of other countries prove to a demonstration, that however ample such powers were, they were always a delegated trust. In England the first Bishops were invested with the most extensive authority; but was Augustine or his followers therefore independant of the holy See?

In Ireland, which never had been reduced to the form of a Roman province, and with which on that account the intercourse with Rome was more difficult than even with the “*toto divisos orbe Britannos*”—these delegated powers were still more ample, and the Prelate of Armagh seems for centuries to have been a *Legatus natus*, or by virtue of his office, a legate of the Holy See.

The inundation of the northern and western hordes, who changed the once polished empire of Augustus and Constantine into wastes partitioned out amongst ferocious bands, who substituted their own grotesque languages and customs for those of ancient Rome, destroying commerce and almost every means of communication, encreased the embarrassments

of the Holy See, and rendered it still more difficult for her to exercise for some centuries her rightful sway over the Churches of the western world. It was during this interval and when the computation of the Vernal Equinox could not easily be communicated from one country to another that the error respecting the time of celebrating Easter, prevailed here, and that our Church harrassed by barbarians and afflicted by civil wars fell away from her ancient fervour, and tolerated uncouth usages and gross scandals which were unknown in better times. Had Rome been always able to extend to us her protecting care, these never would have existed, and Declan would not have to reproach this “one independent Church in the West, with excesses which rendered it impossible to reclaim her even to the popery of a civilized kingdom,” nor should we have to lament the obstinacy with which our fathers clung to an old abuse; an obstinacy resulting from that character which the state of society produced, as much as from a tenaciousness of old customs whether reasonable or otherwise, for which an ancient country such as ours, is always distinguished.

The Missions however of the Bishops of Limerick, of Lismore, and of Leighlin to Rome, their commissions from the Holy See to reclaim their countrymen from indigenous errors in discipline, not from Asiatic ones, as none but Ledwich and his disciples pretend, prove satisfactorily that the spirit of subordination to the mother and mistress of all Churches (as the Greeks and Latins stile the See of Peter in the Council of Florence) had never ceased in Ireland. Columbanus himself in the most energetic of his remonstrances, even whilst he impugned the proceedings of a Pope, on a subject which had taken deep root in his own mind, and interested his feelings beyond the limits of discretion—even he professed and observed that obedience which was due by a deserving Son of the Church to the *spiritual head* of all the faithful.

Ireland, therefore, whether by the purity of her faith—or by the correction of her errors in discipline, has uniformly proved her union with, and subjection to that rock on which

Christ founded his Church, and from which alone flowed that fountain of living waters which cleansed this once Pagan hemisphere from the impurities of heathenism.

Those who would have us indebted for the faith to some unknown country in the East, because we were for a time subject to an error, apparently like to that of the Quartodecimans, have been obliged to abandon their silly invention to the contempt it deserved; and those who with Declan would insinuate, that we were at any time independent of the Holy See, because certain circumstances of the life of Patrick, (like every other private occurrence of the time) are obscure, and from our intercourse with Rome having been difficult and often interrupted—would substitute like Mosheim and his Amphyctionic assemblies, sophisms and hypotheses, for historical facts and logical deductions.

But this diversion by which Declan endeavours to shift the attack, which he supposes to be made by me on the temporalities of the establishment will deceive no person: as a question of history it is as relevant to the religion or state of Ireland as a dissertation on “the North-West passage.” But if by it he would affect to disturb the prerogatives of the See of Rome, he will find them strong and immoveable as the base on which this island rests, and it would be a work of less difficulty to float her upon the Atlantic, than unsettle them in the order established by Christ.

The glance which I have here taken at the relation in which the Churches of the West have stood at different times with regard to the See of St. Peter, is founded on a mass of authorities too large to be even enumerated. Many of them are quoted in the very learned and able work of Mr. Clinch stiled “Letters on Church Government.”

Fleury, D'Marca, Thomassin, Cardinal Lupus, in short all who have treated largely of Church history or discipline, have furnished proofs irrefragable of the unceasing jurisdiction exercised by the Popes throughout the universe, but above all within their Patriarchate of the West.

This jurisdiction exceeded without doubt its just limits,

when the barbarians who overran the fallen empire, became believers in Christ ; but even that very excess furnishes a strong proof of the existence of a rightful power without which the finesse, the diplomacy, the cold, calculating ambition of the Roman Court, to which Declan attributes such success, would have been indignantly spurned by the followers of Clovis, or by the Goths and Vandals, still more free and untamed. Nay this excess, to which the spiritual power of the Popes became allied in time, has contributed more perhaps than any other cause, true religion alone excepted, to the production of regular governments international-law, and all the advantages which flow from them. It was the shell, to borrow a metaphor from the illustrious Grattan, in which the system of European society was hatched ; that society being long since perfected the shell has been burst and cast away, but the supremacy of Peter and of his successors, as it existed before the present European institutions, so it will continue after them, unless they too, are destined to last until the consummation.

To sum up these observations ! 1. We are certain, as of any similar historical fact, that St. Patrick was at Rome, and received his mission from the lips of Pope Celestine. 2. It concerns us not whether he received it from him or from his delegate, St. Germanus. 3. That were he sent here even *without the knowledge of the Pope*, his mission would still be sanctioned by the tacit consent of the latter. 4. That the Church of Ireland has never at any period been independent of the Holy See, however the intercourse between it and Rome may have occasionally been interrupted : and lastly, this the Church is almost THE ONLY NATIONAL CHURCH IN THE UNIVERSE THAT HAS NEVER GIVEN BIRTH TO HERESY OR BEEN TORN BY SCHISM, while it has produced a greater number of holy and apostolic men than any other Church equally numerous upon the face of the earth. Rome, the mother and mistress of all Churches not included in any comparison.

The person therefore who would impugn the Apostolic character of our Church by such arguments as those used

or insinuated by Declan either labours to sustain a bad cause by flimsy expedients, or shews that he is entirely unacquainted with ancient Church discipline.

Communion between the head and members of the mystic body of Christ was at all times equally essential to Christianity: the modes of this communion have been as various as the customs of the several ages through which it has subsisted. But to infer that because Catholic discipline in this respect was not the same at a period when as many months would be necessary for strangers to hold communication with Rome as are now required of days, is to make our selfish and contracted notions the rule of what was just, useful and becoming at all times for the great empire of Christ. It reminds me of the many members of the *Fudge-Family* whom I met with from time to time upon the continent, who were shocked at the bad taste of those who could prefer a French *ragout* or a Spanish *oleo* to the beef and pudding of an English board. So accustomed is ignorance to make *home* the standard of excellence, and to stare with wonder, perhaps with contempt, at what appears strange only because it is unknown to some unfledged traveller or essayist.

But it may be that this advocate of the Irish Church had no ulterior views when he introduced at the close of his pleadings this sketch of his antiquarian knowledge, and that he only wished to intimate the ample stores of such learning which, no doubt, he possesses; leaving him therefore to write essays on the ruins of Palmyra or the site of Troy, should he be so disposed, I shall proceed to review his work.

The character which he gives, page 4, of a sect of Protestants appears to me the most extraordinary I ever read. Had his hairs grown white in the service of Popery—were he one of those Courtiers or Cardinals, whom, after Voltaire, he describes as destitute of every feeling but those arising from an inordinate ambition, I do not know how he could describe the opposers of his ruling passion better than by saying of them—“that their doctrine, character, discipline

“may be judged by the declaration of their ministers *for the time*, that they have no permanent standard to measure, “no external authority to controul their principles, that “with them religion is in truth but the ‘Cynthia of a minute,’ and can be caught only by immediate observation.”

The speech recorded by Pallavicini, as delivered by the Nuncio Aleander before Charles the Fifth and the diet of the Empire against Luther and his followers, though one of the most able productions I have ever read, has nothing in force or justice superior to this; and I do believe that had the Primate, who though not perhaps a profound divine, understands sufficiently well the doctrine and interests of the Establishment, had his Grace attended to this passage he would have had some misgivings about the orthodoxy of his chosen advocate, and either have withdrawn his protection from him, or dismissed him altogether from his service. What! the doctrine of the Established Church to depend on the declaration of its Ministers *for the time being*, without a standard to measure or authority to regulate it! This is truly awful to the religious mind, which dreads being tossed about by every wind of doctrine—No fixed principle to regulate opinions or practice!—No standard whereby to discern truth from falsehood.—The Creed of the Church liable to daily changes! dependant on the caprice of teachers who differ from each other! light and passing as “the Cynthia of a minute”! This is a dire attack upon the religion of the State, more severe than what its most bitter opponent might be prepared to express, and no Catholic will hesitate to prefer his own Creed and principles, unchangeable and inflexible as they are, to those of a religion which her apologist, by the substitution of a word, might designate in the language of Pope, describing “frailty herself.”

“Nothing more true than what you once let fall,
“Our religion has no character at all.”

This apologist of the Establishment introduces by a laboured preface, in which truth and error are ingeniously blend-

ed, an extract from the D. E. Post describing the installment of a Catholic Dean in Limerick, when "a sermon was delivered, forcibly animadverting on the modern levelling system directed against Church dignities and property," to which he adds one of the commandments of the Church, "to pay tithe to our Pastors," extracted from a Catechism published in 1819, and from which he wishes his readers to infer (the disclaimer of J. K. L. notwithstanding) that the Romish Clergy have not resigned their pretensions to the temporalities of the Established Church. From such a frontispiece, the reader will form his own judgment of the profound character of Declan's work !

The panegyric which in this preface Declan pronounces on our Church-Government is well merited, and there is no sentiment in his essay to which I more heartily subscribe. But whilst he assigns it to worldly policy, we shall always consider it as the fruit of the wisdom of the Father, and attribute it to the influence of that Spirit which guides the rulers of the Church in accommodating their discipline to times and circumstances, "with the prudence of serpents" and the simplicity of doves." We will, however, never submit to the imputation "that our Creed for twelve centuries has been made subservient to a desire of secular dominion."

The unchangeableness of our faith and the vicissitudes which the secular power of the Church has undergone, afford at least a strong presumptive proof that the former has never been subservient to the latter, for that which is *dependant* must change, but what remains unaltered should be deemed *chief* and *independent*.

But Declan, as has been usual with his predecessors confounds the Creed of our Church with her discipline, and makes tythes and temporalities the objects of her infallibility.

In this we recognize the ingenuity of an advocate pleading before a jury unacquainted with the law, but we seek in vain for the candour of a Christian or the skill and knowledge of the Jurist or Divine.

Our Creed is uniform, but the articles which compose it

regard "*what does not appear*" to our senses or understandings, "*the substance of things hoped for,*" to speak the language of St. Paul.

The objects of the infallibility of our Church are alone *articles of faith, the moral virtues of the Gospel, or that discipline which is essentially connected with the former*; such, for instance, as the distribution of the Blessed Eucharist in one or both kinds, the administration of Baptism by aspersion or immersion; but to attribute infallibility to her in arranging territorial rights, or glebes for the support of the Clergy, is what never entered into the mind of a Catholic.

The Prelates of the Church, like every other body to whom the care and government of a vast community, enjoying rights and possessions of a civil, ecclesiastical and mixed nature belong, have in every age, sometimes alone, generally in concurrence with secular Princes, enacted laws to regulate the *things* and *persons* subject to their jurisdiction; but these laws partake as little of the character or quality of infallibility or immutability as acts of Parliament, which in each session are repealed, altered, or amended. These church laws are general, or particular, favourable or odious, like as the civil laws of every state; and being enacted according to the exigencies of times, places, and circumstances, they are repealed modified, or annulled by subsequent laws—by usage—prescription—disuse—in precisely the same manner as civil and municipal laws are changed or affected.

Let Declan open the Corpus Juris, or any body of Canon Law, and enumerate if he can, the almost infinite number of canons which have existed in the Church, and which are now a useless lumber; and yet he would have the unlettered crowd who may read his pamphlet, to believe, that every one of these carries on its front the seal of infallibility!

It is moreover to be observed, that even if laws, *purely ecclesiastical*, partook of infallibility, (the very idea is absurd) yet the law which vested in the Clergy of Ireland a right to

tithe was not such, whereas the decree of Cashel had all its force as far as temporalities were concerned, from Henry II. and those Irish Chieftains, who were parties to its enactment, or who afterwards assented to it. "The legate, it is true, gave to it the sanction of the Church" and this sanction, by the usage of these times, secured to the property created by the law, certain ecclesiastical privileges.

To be brief, the secular power gave tithes to the Church, the ecclesiastical authority as it were, consecrated their use.

But at all times, and in all countries, tithes and church lands might pass away from the Clergy, and become again secularized. A prescription of forty years would make good a title against any Bishop or Parson; that of one hundred years would annul the title to property even of the Church of Rome; *and there is not at present a single nation in Europe* in which peaceable possession is not had and retained without let or hindrance either in the external forum or court of conscience, of property wrested even by violence from ecclesiastics, whether such property consist of abbey lands, mensal lands, tithes or glebes. But where the legislative power or the head of the state has transferred such property, or confiscated it, there is not upon record, within my knowledge, a solitary instance of the Church doing more than remonstrate, and finally acquiesce.

But where the transfer has not only been legally made, but when centuries have elapsed to confirm the possession as is the case in Ireland, to charge us with a design of looking to what the situation of the country, the spirit of the age, the interest of the people, and of the government, as well as the existing laws—render impossible and absurd, is unjust. It is an effort to cast upon us an odium which we do not merit. But to identify such a charge with our belief in the infallibility of the Church, or to deduce such inference from it, is the effect either of ignorance, or of a wilful intention to misrepresent the truth. The simile adduced by Declan, of a judge abjuring an act of Parliament, when its enactments are supposed to be in full vigour, is pregnant with a slanderous imputation, of which I trust,

had he been conscious, he would have cast it from him with all the abhorrence it deserved. Did a judge, indeed proclaim from the bench, that the statute which deprived the Catholic Father of the guardianship of his own child, and made him tenant for life should his son abjure his religion, was not now in force; such declaration would bear an exact resemblance to a Catholic Bishop, declaring that his right to tithe and churchlands in Ireland is extinct before God and man.

But to return to the grounds of the impeachment, to wit, the induction of a Catholic Dean in Limerick.

If some unknown and unheeded preacher vented his zeal on that occasion against the Spanish Cortes perhaps, who might then have been employed in acting over the scenes of the French revolution, or delivered a Philippic against the followers of Captain Rock who were plundering the establishment, should his fanciful or charitable efforts be distorted into an argument to prove the malevolence of our designs? BUT A DEAN WAS NOMINATED TO THE CATHOLIC CHAPTER OF LIMERICK. Does this, then, fill the Establishment with alarm? If so, why are Bishops tolerated? why is the religion recognized by law, to which an Hierarchy is essential? Let the demon of persecution be again invoked by the churchmen,—by this army of the Faith. Let our houses of worship be again demolished, our Priests be hunted like savage beasts, and a *nameless statute* prepared to be re-enacted against them.

But they have survived all this, and the fire of persecution has but brightened their chains, and though lighted again it would not consume them. If their Hierarchy continue unbroken, if their Chapters have been filled up, and their Deans instituted in the darkness of the night, and the silence of the morass or the desert, will not the philosopher and legislator recognize their existence as he does the sunshine in the mid-day, and secure their willing obedience and unfeigned attachment, by casting on them like our gracious Monarch and benevolent Viceroy, the look of sympathy;

and cheering their labours in the public service, by an expression of regard ?

The Church-men and their advocate may read over two-and-twenty editions of a Catechism, and select from the last or the first an obsolete command about tythes, which if it serve any purpose can serve only theirs ; the statesman however, and proprietors of Ireland will not descend with them to search on shelves for Catechisms, they will estimate public men and public interests by another rule.

But to treat of this ominous Catechism.

There is a great variety of Catechisms in Ireland, and every printer publishes which of them he listeth for the sake of gain. Most of them are nearly literal translations from some Catechism used upon the continent where tithes *were* paid. In the copy approved of by the four Archbishops, the mention of tithes was omitted to avoid giving offence, and (“ contribute to the support of your pastors ”) the substance of the Gospel precept inserted in its place : but the meaning of this commandment of the Church is explained according to the Gospel sense in all the Catechisms which I have seen, and the most simple child of our communion, knows that “ he who gives of spiritual things “ should receive of temporal things,” as the Apostle declares : He is also taught by experience, that these temporal things are not tithes, which the Proctor like a bird of prey, carries off to be devoured.

J. K. L. has catechised more children in a few years than Declan probably will in the course of his life, and he declares that he does not recollect, in that time, having once met with a Catechism of this alarming 22d edition : He believes there have been five hundred editions of the Catechism, since the only copy corrected and approved of by the Archbishops was published. He has himself procured one, without attending to this command, and he believes, the Printers or Prelates who may have published or procured others were equally indifferent as J. K. L. to the form of words in which this precept of the Church was couched, provided the sense of the divine and apostolic in-

junction was plainly and clearly expressed. But I have done with a subject which a writer having claims to character, should not have introduced.

To proceed to the discussion on the *rights* of the Church, for Declan has thought proper to adjourn the question of her utility, and should he, when redeeming his pledge of writing a distinct letter to his Excellency on the latter subject not succeed better than he has done in this his first essay, there may be some friends of the establishment who would wish the adjournment to have been *sine die*. But leaving the prudence of the matter to those mainly interested, my business is to treat of what has been placed before the public, and which is introduced by some reflections very like in their tenor and justice to the general preface on which I have already animadverted. The substance of them is borrowed from Doctor Lanigan's very useful history, and what the writer has interspersed of his own is not warranted by facts or philosophy.

The right for example, given by the King to levy tithes, could not, as Declan seems to assume, be valid in law or equity if it had not been sanctioned by the Irish chieftains, for those few Tanists who acknowledged at Cashel Henry as Lord paramount, never conceived the thought of surrendering to him the dominion of their principalities, or enabling him by their recognition of his alledged right to the sovereignty, to dispose, independently of their will, of one tenth of their property for any purpose which he might deem proper. His power was not as great even amongst the few who *professed* obedience to him, as that of our present King over the properties of his subjects, and is it because in the title of an Act of Parliament and in legal parlance the King is said to enact the law, that we are to believe that the Lords and Commons are not an integral part of the legislature, or that the act of the Sovereign in regulating the rights or property of his subjects would have any force in law or equity without their concurrence?

In the time of Henry there was scarcely any such thing in Ireland as an English pale, and the Irish were not "so

“enslaved to papal authority” as to admit the transfer of their rights by Adrian to a foreign potentate. Perhaps Declan will defend this act of sovereignty attempted to be exercised by the Court of Rome over our country, and unless he does, it is impossible for him to establish for the Norman Prince a right to transfer tithes to the Church independent of the Irish Chieftains.

These latter received Henry only as a “*primus inter pares*,” entitled to govern with the same authority as they were accustomed to recognize in their own “Monarchs of Ireland,” but to suppose that they enabled him to transfer their property to the Church, independent of their own will is to assert what the most slender acquaintance with Irish history and the principles of Irish as well as general law at that period, will disprove.

Nor is Declan authorized to say that the Irish people in those times had no rights or independence. They were not mere Serfs like the English under the feudal system. The Brehon-laws—the laws of Tanistry gave essentially a certain portion of right and independence to every Irishman. But probably Declan has been so engaged in researches with Ledwich about St. Patrick, as to divert his attention from the less interesting study of what appertained to the *mere Irish*. Had he devoted his mind to the moral or historical study of a people from one of whose warlike septs he is perhaps descended, he would, I am inclined to think, be of opinion, that their superior civilization—the character of their laws, as well as their native valour, protracted their independence when Gaul and Britain yielded to the sway of the Franks and the Danes; and that notwithstanding their degeneracy and dissensions (natural effects of protracted warfare in the then state of society) they would have had found some Alfred amongst themselves to re-unite their powers and new model their laws as it happened to the Heptarchy in England, if the Normans and a time-serving Pope had not succeeded to the Danes in the work of havoc and destruction.

I can scarcely conceive any employment more unbecoming Declan, or more worthy of the faction to which hope or interest has attached him, than to misrepresent the history and character of his country,—to disguise by sophistry the nature of law, and origin of right, and to labour to attribute to those who are *Kat epochen* his own countrymen, disaffected views and designs hostile to the connexion.

Were a silly youth to indulge a vicious nature, and seek to cloak his apostacy from every good principle under a tissue of malignant insinuations, we should not be surprised; but a man who affects to be a man of letters, who is often decorous in his manner and manifestly anxious to preserve an appearance of consistency to a character he has compromised, to find him descend to the selfish cant of a malignant party, is much to be deplored.

Does Declan conceive that men of sense and acquainted with the nature of things, men who either possess interests of their own or who are engaged by conscience and every sense of duty to promote the interests of the community to which they belong; does he suppose that such men cannot study the history of their country, lament her fallen greatness, wish that she had never been subjected to the sway of a stranger; but that like Gaul or Britain she had been suffered to mature her own institutions, to establish her own sovereignty, or to form a federal league with the adjoining island; or that they, finding those things now rendered impossible are not anxious to close the crater of the volcano, and promote the public good by every practicable means?

If I be a Milesian, why should I be less well affected to a Norman or a Saxon, than to a Dane or to a Firbolg, or to any one of the numerous tribes whom Sir James Ware, for example enumerates as forming the ancient population of Ireland. What is wanted—what is desired—are men Irish in affection, no matter whence their origin. Men, who seek to promote the happiness of the country in the only way which is now possible—by identifying her laws, institutions, interests with those of England, and forming

of both islands one solid empire. This mode of proceeding would extinguish jealousies, amalgamate the people and supersede that odious and anti-social duty which in an evil hour Declan has assigned to the established Church, of inculcating on the Protestant mind "distrust of their fellow subjects at home, and directing their affections to England as contra-distinguished from their own country."

J. K. L. renders thanks to Providence, that no such feeling ever entered into his mind ; and he proclaims loudly on the part of the Irish Catholics that no such anti-social spirit prevails amongst them, that they care not whence their neighbours derive their origin, whether from Thrace, Germany, Spain, Gaul or Britain, provided they are attached to Ireland and anxious for her welfare. With them, though religion is not "the Cynthia of the minute ;" yet it teaches them to embrace every Christian as a brother and obliges them to yield a constitutional obedience to the Monarch who is not less the object of their loyalty than of their love. They seek for no separation, they have received good and evil from England. They know that a contest with her would prove destructive to Ireland, but that a cordial union of the countries would impart to this country a portion of the power and industry of Britain—the blessing of her laws and institutions, as well as the security and privileges to be derived from her invincible strength and towering station amongst the nations.

Declan must be convinced of this, if his education and habits of thought resulting from it, have not biassed his understanding. But the faction whose alienation from Ireland and hostility to her happiness, he avows and advocates, can neither comprehend truth, or if they comprehend it, endeavour to extinguish its light. They hate it, because "their works are evil."

If the Irish were incorrigible in their antipathy to England and not in their antipathy to tyranny and injustice, how comes it that Declan no sooner changes his creed and profession, than from a Milesian, who should hate the con-

nection, he becomes a very advocate of intolerance and worships the idol of ascendancy? If an "O," or a "Mac," generate disloyalty, why is a Thomond unfriendly to his own Sept, or the descendant of the Hy Nials the grand master of an orange gang? If hostility to England be natural to the aboriginal inhabitants, why are the descendants of the Catholics of the pale amongst the most zealous and clamorous of those who seek for equal laws, and thereby endanger the connection? But no! we find the aggrieved without distinction of origin, claiming justice for Ireland, and we find the faction and their dupes opposed to all who seek to equalize the law, and cement by encroachments upon their monopoly, the union of the countries.

And if that hostility to England be attributed to religion, we have only to look to South America, in which there is but one Creed, and where the strife and dissention which now agitate Ireland have left the bones of thousands to bleach on the morass, and almost depopulated once more the fairest portion of the globe!

The prefatory remarks to Declan's discussion on the origin of right in the Establishment have occasioned these observations. I now proceed to his assertion, attributing to me what *I never uttered or wrote in sense or terms*, viz. "that a Christian Church cannot have a just title to "permanent property." Something analogous to this might be found amongst the errors of Wickliffe or Huss, with whom Declan since his change of Creed claims some connection, but was never written by a Catholic Divine. On this subject I have therefore nothing to reply; nor is it necessary to repeat my arguments against "the right divine" of the Church, (her defenders having abandoned with one accord that long contested position,) but I cannot so easily relinquish my right to claim these arguments as my own, and the vanity of an essayist obliges me to assure Declan, that the work of Mr. O'Driscoll, which he quotes as supplying me with materials, has never been seen by me.

He will also permit me to distinguish his position, "that "the Clergy had a right to the tenth of the cattle." To

lambs, fleeces, calves and milk, goslings, ducks, and all the feathered domesticated tribe, I allow they had, not excepting "the noisy younglings of the foetid sty," to these they had a legal claim sustained by many a wise decision of their courts, founded on the Levitical law; but of cattle which yielded no annual encrease, they had not. They could not carry off the tenth cow or the tenth bullock from the pasture or the lawn, or I am much deceived; and if they could not, Declan's tedious argument serves only to deceive, but detracts nothing from the truth or force of what I had written.

But to proceed to that part of the essay in which Declan puts forth all his strength; we find that he endeavours to sustain the rights of the Establishment by two arguments:—The first, of analogy, and which therefore may or may not be conclusive, according as the analogy is just or otherwise. This argument is taken from the nature of feudal tenures; The second, from eleemosynary foundations by the Crown. The first is most pleasing to Declan, and in his satisfaction he forgets that it proves too much, and therefore looses its force; or he admits all its consequences and attributes to something like accident, that the property of the Church *has not descended in families*, as it did in Armagh, by open violence and sacriligious rapine before the time of Celsus; or he justifies by it the frightful idea he presents to us of his Church, established here *without a mission* and only as a permanent police establishment, or a sort of pedagogical institution—to inculcate distrust and dissention for "peace and good-will," or again, *proh pudor!* as a kind of farming society!!

But to return to this, his favourite argument. He sketches the history of feudal tenures, and tells us that on the demise of the Chief or Baron, the feif reverted to the Crown, and could be given by the Prince to any person indifferently as well as to the descendant of the late Chieftain—that by degrees this right in the Prince was modified, and out of it grew the right of *willing* or *entailing*. It is from this statement of such tenures, he intends the public should in-

fer that an Ecclesiastical Corporation might inherit, and were it not for some unaccountable peculiarity in their condition, might also devise by will as the descendants of the feudal Barons do in the present times. Had Declan not been engaged to plead specially for the Establishment, he would not have disguised what is most important with regard to feudal tenures, namely the nature and origin of them. Instead of confounding them with *benefices* of Roman origin, and which name they obtained only since the introduction of Roman law, he would have informed his reader that when the Northern hordes possessed themselves of the Western Empire the lands were partitioned amongst their leaders,—Princes, Dukes, Counts, Knights, &c.; and that as the whole possession was a common stock won by the sword, the military leaders were vested with their respective portions of it in full sovereignty, on the condition of defending it by their united force against every hostile aggression. On the demise of any one of them, his feif or portion reverted to the common stock, and the, Prince as the representative of the whole Society, conferred it either on the son or on one of the kindred of the deceased, or upon some other, capable of watching over the public interests, and waging war, if necessary, in their defence. The changes in the tenures followed naturally the changes in the state of society, and settled gradually, as the hordes became civilized, into what is now understood by the feudal system. This system was introduced into England by the Normans at the conquest, and continued there unbroken until the reign of the seventh Henry. Many of its traces are to be found in our institutions and laws to this day. Our House of Lords, the titles of our Nobility, of our Sheriffs, and of most of our public officers are remains of it—moulded anew in the progress of time and change of circumstances. When the Feudal Chieftans embraced Christianity, they gave baronies or fiefs to Bishops and Abbots, imposing on them an obligation of either serving in war in person or by deputy, and contributing the aid of their vassals, money, and provisions to the common cause.

When the Sovereign in each country had gradually subdued the Barons, and introduced standing armies as a means of offensive and defensive warfare, they exchanged the system of feudal service for that of benevolence or taxation, to which all lands and property became subject. It was then the Church put forth claims of exemption, and pleaded special privileges against the state. The merits of Saint Thomas of Canterbury, consisted in his support of these against the encroachments of his Master, and to his opposition, and that of such men, England is indebted for most of her valuable rights. Had she not had Bishops as well as Barons of wisdom and fortitude, her *Magna Charta* never would have existed, and her Government this day might be as despotic as that of Spain. This is the origin of many former possessions of the Church ; but except in Germany, where they have been converted into electoral principalities, or secularized in some other way, I doubt whether more than a remnant of them exists in any state in Europe.

The Clergy never indeed relinquished them without a struggle, but there was an innate sense in the breasts of men which convinced them of the incongruity of a Bishop being a feudal Baron, and, although through a just reverence for their sacred character and the interests of religion, they were still allowed seats in the legislative assemblies or councils of kings, most of their possessions have been secularized. *The very nature of their tenure*, by which Declan would support their title, was the cause why they were restored to their proper office, and less worldly sphere.

But in Ireland the feudal system, properly so called, NEVER EXISTED. *The possessions of the Irish Church never partook of its nature*, they were gifts from the Tanists, or from the Kings or Nobles who sought as often by such donations to atone for their plunder and rapine, as they did to indulge their piety by assigning a portion of their property to the support of the poor, of the Church, or of the Priest.

In Ireland, therefore, Church property, *even the Church lands*, are eleemosynary foundations, or a property assigned

by the State, or by individuals to corporations *on certain conditions and for certain services to be performed*, as the original charters testify, and the history of the country proves to a demonstration; they do not by any means partake of the nature of feudal tenures. So that even if this kind of tenure, which has not been able to secure Church property when the interests of society required its being new-modelled, were sufficient to place our Church establishment on the footing of private property, unhappily for the Churchmen it does not exist. Declan must therefore abandon his first argument derived from the feudal tenures, as his patrons have no such title, and rest his defence on the ordinary plea of the Church being a corporation, endowed by the State or by individuals with certain properties, vested in it for certain fixed services, a right of visitation always remaining *ex natura rei*, in the supreme power to which the care of the community is entrusted.

Upon this view of the case I am prepared to join issue with Declan; it is much more interesting to Ireland than any inquiry about the travels of St. Patrick upon the Continent, or into the Islands of the Tuscan Sea, where he is said to have spent several years in the practice of the most sublime virtues.

That the Church established, considered as a whole, forms a corporation, as well as every parish in the kingdom, is a truth with which every scholar is familiar. The preliminaries of Blackstone's Commentaries teach it to every youth whose name is registered in the King's Inns; so that Declan might have withheld the display of erudition by which he would lead his readers to a knowledge of this truth, as well as of that other opinion "that the power of devising by "will is derived from the law," an opinion, however, which no man acquainted with the nature of property will admit, in an unqualified sense. From the flippancy in which this grave and important subject is disposed of by this writer on the authority of Blackstone, one would be led to suspect that his study of *right* and *justice* is extremely superficial.

But to return to the subject of corporations, and namely

to that of the Church, which he exhibits, justly enough as an eleemosynary foundation by the crown. This definition, then being admitted, as the ground of some reflections, does it follow that the property of this legal establishment is of the same nature as private property purchased or inherited by individuals under the sanction of the law?

Are, for instance, the patrimonial inheritances of his Grace the Duke of Leinster an eleemosynary foundation by the Crown, or are they not gifts of the royal bounty to his more than illustrious ancestors for services performed to the State, or some other valuable consideration—or purchases for money paid—or inheritances legally bequeathed? And who will presume to say that the Crown has a right to interfere with the disposal of them? May they not be sold, mortgaged or disposed of, at the will and pleasure of the Noble Proprietor, should he or his ancestors not have entailed them by a voluntary act under the sanction of the law? But will Declan assert the same of Corporate properties? No, he admits, and it would be useless to deny it, that as all Corporations were instituted and endowed for some specific purpose, the Patron, if it be a private grant, has reserved for himself or his appointee, a right of visitation; or if it be a public one, such as the Church at large is, then this right of visitation, at least in this country where the concurrent jurisdiction of the Pope in beneficiary matters is annulled by law, belongs to the head of the State, as the representative of the community.

And what does this right of visitation imply? It implies a power to do whatever is necessary for the public good, as far as such Corporation is connected with it—to enquire into the conduct of its members—to hear complaints—to redress injuries—to inflict summary and extra-judicial punishment—to correct abuses—to reform discipline—or should it be found necessary, to declare the charter forfeited—or suppress the corporation altogether, should it be found, like the Knights Templars, or the Jesuits in the opinion of the Popes and Princes of the last century, not to fulfil the end of its institution.

To deny this right to the supreme power in the State with regard to Corporations generally, is to argue against the nature of things, against the plainest principles of municipal law, against the universal opinion of jurists, against the example and practice of every state in Europe—it is, as I observed elsewhere, to impeach the proceedings of every Sovereign of England who visited and suppressed Church establishments in the 16th century, and to question the title of the most distinguished families of both countries to a very considerable portion of their rights and possessions. Is Declan prepared to admit these consequences? I should fancy not, unless he appeal to the Pope for protection, or has discovered some title in the Church Corporation even more invulnerable than the “right divine.”

But what is to become of the property which might thus be withdrawn from the body Corporate? It rests of its nature in the Crown, as the depository of all the goods of the community to which no individual has a legal claim, and the Crown is obliged to employ it for the public good, and the means of doing so are never wanted.

I am far from concluding from this argument that the Church established should be deprived of its property. I am only proving the right of the Crown with regard to Corporations, a right which Declan has in an evil hour called into question, and I might add, expressly denied, but the denial of which would lead to the establishment of Popery in all its ancient horrors, or to something worse than that Radicalism, which he attributes to J. K. L. This inference is not exaggerated; for if such a right did not exist, a wrong might not only remain without a remedy contrary to the maxims of law, but the absence of it would lead to the subversion of society—by annulling the omnipotence of the legislature and placing the corruption of public bodies above the correction or control of the State.

Having thus disposed of the principle which regulates corporations such as the Church confessedly is, we may proceed to discuss the application of it to the origi-

nal grant of tithes—to their use and end, as well as the transfer of them to their present possessors.

Tithes were granted at Cashel by the King and his Barons as well as some Irish Chieftains according to the tenor of the well-known Canon cited by Declan. They were granted as the result proved, partly to Abbeys, to Convents, to collegiate Churches: but still the greater part of them to the secular parochial Clergy to be collected and employed according to the canons and usages of the times.

I know of no part of Declan's essay in which he betrays a greater want of candour or greater lack of knowledge in ecclesiastical matters than he does by intimating that the tithes were given to the Clergy *unconditionally*, because the terms of the Canon are indefinite. It is certainly not pleasing to me to charge a polite writer, however rude or uncourteous to Popery and to J. K. L., with ignorance or bad faith, but it is still more painful to argue with a man who has only a tinge of literature on the subjects which he undertakes to discuss.

How ridiculous would not a lawyer appear who should call for a decision on a statute which merely enacted the application of several others, without once referring to them, or to the interpretation or former decisions of the Court upon them. Yet such is the conduct of Declan.

Because the Canon of Cashel enacts "that tithes shall be paid to the Clergy," he infers that they have only to collect them into their granaries and farm-yards, without any regard to the usages of the Church, or to the numberless statutes which regulated their kind, quantity, mode of collection or recovery, or even the uses to which they were to be applied? Yet all these should be known and observed.

In France from which Henry came to this country, at that time as well as in 1274 above a century afterwards, when the second Council of Lyons was celebrated, (which Council was an universal one) tithes were applied to the support of the Bishop, of the Clergy, of the fabric, and of the poor. The law or usage which regulated their appli-

cations, was every where observed, and in no place more exactly than in England; witness the 24th of Elfric's Canons which says, "let the Priests receive the tithes.....
 "let them set apart the first share for the building, and
 "ornamenting of the Church, and distribute the second
 "with their own hands to the poor and the strangers with
 "mercy and humility, and reserve the third part for themselves." There was no intention on the part of Henry, and the delegate of the Holy See, to bring about a conformity in the discipline of the Irish Church to that of the other Churches of Europe, in all things else tithes only excepted. The truth is, that not only were the general laws for the collection and application of tithes introduced into Ireland, but that they continued in force in this country after they had gone into disuse in most others, and that the present proprietors have the singular merit of discarding the poor, of neglecting the fabric, of abandoning to penury their own serving clergy, for the sole purpose of appropriating the entire income of the Corporation to which they are trustees, to their own real or factitious wants. But if they have not erected, nor ornamented Colleges or Churches—if they have not formed libraries, or created or endowed public institutions for the poor, or the infirm, or the stranger, they have at least faithfully executed the extraordinary trust before-mentioned which their new advocate has assigned them.

It is also to be observed, that the Parochial Clergy at the period when a portion of the tithes were allotted to them, were in a proportion of at least *three* to each *one* of the Parochial Clergy of the present day, as may be proved by a reference to the number of parishes episcopally united in these latter times, and which unions are recorded in the registers of the several dioceses. The ancient Clergymen moreover, were employed in professional duties from the rising to the setting sun, whereas Declan says of those now established that they have no Missionary character! How truly has it been said, "that they are conscious of not answering the end for which any Christian Church has ever been erected!"

But their advocate does not stop here. After expressing the impossibility of J. K. L. knowing for what purpose they were placed amongst us by the British, he conjectures, it may have been to watch the Irish as spies; to inculcate on the minds of the settlers, that this was a place of banishment, but that England was their true home from which flowed every benediction, and that through it lay the broad way to heaven: or last of all, they may have been sent here as a farming society! Good God, what an idea does this writer seek to convey to us of a Christian Priesthood! No missionary character! Political agents of the lowest description! Apostles of disunion! Tillers of land!

It is but too true, this character given to the body by Declan has been verified in many of them from the days of Boulter to the present time; and it is equally true, that it behoves all Irishmen who love their country, now that the nature and end of the establishment is proclaimed by its professed apologist, to be opposed "to peace and good will," it behoves them to consider seriously whether the teachers of such a Gospel deserve to be trusted as guides in seeking the public weal, whether Irishmen should continue the dupes of a party who avow their dislike to the country, and who profess that for three centuries they have been zealous Apostles of disunion, sowers of discord—advocates of oppression. Happily for human nature, though this may have been the *Esprit de corps*, there have been of their body men who would not have put even a mitre in competition with their love of country! Swift has not been the only patriot their body has produced: and much as every true Irishman must detest the principle now published by their champion and he a "*transfuga de castris*" "*Argivum*," yet we will not cease to hope, that a native virtue and a national spirit, which no education can eradicate, will cause many of them to disavow in word and work as they have done, hitherto the odious and contemptible character with which it is sought to invest them.

But to resume the principle which regulates corporations.

We have seen the conditions on which tithes were given to the established Church in the time of Henry II. We will not enquire into the merits of the forfeiture on the part of the Churchmen of the 16th century. It consisted in an unwillingness on their part to change their creed or to recognize in the King or Parliament the right or power to alter or modify it. Whether this was a crime or not, whether for this they deserved to be called "a restless and traitorous faction," and that by a false brother, will yet be decided before a tribunal more awful than that of Kings or Parliaments. But whether justly or otherwise, the fact is certain that the ancient Clergy were ousted from their possessions, and that the state transferred those possessions partly to laymen, partly to public institutions, and the remainder to those, who by their pliancy to power succeeded to the "restless and traitorous faction."

Though Declan should have so subdued his nature and extinguished in his own breast all filial reverence and respect for the religion and ancestry from which he descended, as to call the one a "grey iniquity," and represent the other as a "corrupt Mass," yet he should not have gratuitously assumed, that they had violated conditions essential to the well-being of the State, or that the crown by waging a successful war against an independent nation had re-entered upon its original rights. No part of his assertions upon these subjects is warranted by history. The crown of England *had no original rights in Ireland*, unless a papal Bull forsooth would bestow them, until she acquired them by compact, or the sword; and if the men who sustained the cause of Charles and James in Ireland against Cromwell and William are to be deemed "a traitorous faction," Declan himself, had he lived in these days, would without doubt, be numbered amongst them. The wars which at different periods were waged in Ireland from the 13th to the 18th century should be to the present generation, a subject of deep regret, but to brand those engaged in them with approbrious names or accuse them with the violation of justice or treaties, is to open an account with

antiquity which could never be closed; it is to excite every angry passion at a period when the faction alone obstructs the work of redress and avows their abhorrence of conciliation!

That those who possessed the supreme power in Ireland at any time had a right to visit the public corporations, and so to regulate their properties as the public interests might require, is what alone we seek to establish. That they *did so*, is proved abundantly by the transfer made of the Church establishment at the period when the religion of the State was changed.

An inquiry into the causes or justice of such transfer, would be useless at present, and might produce evil. Three centuries have now almost elapsed since the proceedings occurred, and the right of the Crown which then could not be disputed, is not now to be questioned. Declan, whilst he admits it in words, should not seek to undermine it, by introducing the supposed apostacy of a few Bishops.

The power of the State to create and endow corporate establishments, to visit such establishments, to transfer or to suppress such establishments, is unquestionable. And is not the Church a corporation, or to quote this writer's own words, "an eleemosynary foundation of the Crown?" It cannot appeal to the Pope for protection, or cite laws and statutes like Thomas à Becket, to prove its exemption. What exemption therefore can it plead? or is not the right now asserted as belonging to the legislature—namely, the right to new-model the establishment, the same which it exercised at the time of the transfer.

At that period let it be admitted, that the ancient Clergy forfeited their rights; at present it is not said that these rights are forfeited by the corporators, but it is contended that a case is *made out* and *proved* which would warrant the supreme power in the community to visit this corporation, to search it with a lamp, and so to modify it, as to promote the interests of that community for whose utility alone it was created.

Declan will have it to remain untouched, because,

though it does not answer the ends for which it was originally designed, there is another efficient priesthood to supply its place ; which priesthood he presumes to affirm, “ receives “ as much as that of the establishment throughout the entire island,” with an hesitating exception respecting the Catholic Bishops and the Catholic Clergy of the North. “ It is notorious, he says, that the income of the Parish “ Priests, and still more of the Curates, is greater than “ that of the same ranks among the Established Clergy.”

The truth is, that the Catholic Prelates receive for their support that proportion of the emoluments usually derived to a Parish Priest from one or at most from two parishes together, with some trifling contribution from each of the Clergy, subject to them, once in each year ; this is the total amount of *their* income !

While engaged writing these sheets, J. K. L. has heard of a composition for tithes having been made, with the Parson of the Parish adjoining his residence at the rate of 13 or 14,00*l.* a year, and having examined a registry of returns of the emoluments of the Parish Priest of the same Parish, in 1820, he found that they amounted to SIXTY-FIVE POUNDS ! This is the only return of the kind from that parish to which he has access. The writer also has been himself the Catholic Incumbent of a parish which has lately offered to the Parson 1200*l.* a year in lieu of tithes, and he declares, in the presence of the country, that to the best of his judgment and recollection, he never received from that parish 200*l.* in any shape within one year. The Curates of Parish Priests who reside with their Principal, receive one-fifth of the emoluments, and should they lodge elsewhere, they are allowed one-third.

These facts are the most satisfactory and respectful reply which it is in my power to make to the assertion of Declan—an assertion which it is not permitted me to designate as it deserves. Between both Priesthoods, however, religion must be well preserved ; and if the flocks perish, the misfortune must proceed rather from being too closely shorn than from want of attendance. In their unparalleled penury and distress,

they have also the consolation of suffering "for the good of their souls," and of supporting out of their destitution the gorgeous temple of the establishment, as well as the little Sion in which they themselves occasionally rejoice.

This writer had imbibed too deeply the spirit of his new calling to withhold, when treating of these subjects, his invectives from Mr. O'Connell; and though he does not indulge in the ravings of the more bewildered and infuriated bigots against this distinguished Irishman, yet he endeavours to cover him with with the spray of a mitigated Billingsgate. For my part, I feel a pleasure in being appointed by this modern Apostle of Ardmore, to be "the assessor" of a man whose talents and patriotism I venerate and admire.

I shall always deem it a high honour to number Mr. O'Connell among my friends, and wish earnestly I could lend him any assistance in his efforts to cheer the despondency, and sustain the sinking fate of his country.

He has been long one of her finest ornaments, and most efficient as well as most faithful supporters; but he needs not the aid of J. K. L. more than the towering oak which grows upon his paternal domains requires to be upheld by the homely shrub which creeps in obscurity.

Having thus disposed of whatever deserved notice in the "Case of the Church," on casting my eye over it a second time, I lighted upon a passage in pages 37-8, in which the writer would have us believe "there was not *disruption* of "continuity when the Catholic Clergy gave way to those of "the Establishment."

With both our hands we protest against the impudent assertion! The Hierarchy of the Catholic Church, the entire body of the Catholic Clergy has continued in Ireland through every viscissitude, uninterrupted and unbroken; they have been dispossessed of temporalities which the State gave, and again took away; but THEY ARE ALWAYS THE SAME. Dr. Curtis has succeeded as regularly and canonically to Dowdall and Plunkett, as these did to Patrick and Malachy. There was no disruption of continuity, it is true, but it is equally true, that NO TWO CATHOLIC PRE-

LATES EVER RULED THE SAME CHURCH, OR EVER SAT IN THE SAME SEE WITH THE SAME TITLE. The Established Clergy may have a good title or not, but beyond all doubt THEY WERE NEVER ENGRAFTED UPON OUR STOCK, NEVER SUCCEEDED TO OUR PLACES, WHICH WERE NOT VACATED, NEVER INHERITED JURISDICTION FROM OUR CHURCH, AND HAVE NO JUST CLAIM TO AN IDENTITY WITH US, OR CONTINUITY FROM OUR FATHERS, WHO HELD NO COMMUNION WITH THEM.

A sufficient number, Declan says, of our Prelates and Clergy embraced the new order of things to carry with them the rights of the whole body of their brethren to the tithes, and to continue the Catholicity of the Church. This is certainly a new species of defence, not a pillar of truth, but almost literally a "broken reed."

It were much to be desired that Declan would favour the public with the names of those Prelates and the acts of their abjuration. During the disputes between Dowdall of Armagh and Brown, who had been a Protestant before he was sent to Dublin, I can find but four Bishops charged with even a temporary compromise of principle, and not even one who might not be supposed to have yielded, through error or infirmity, to what was not as yet formally condemned by the Church, rather than to have renounced the faith of their fathers; but admitting that they did heartily conform to the rule of faith and discipline at that time prescribed by Henry or his Secretary Cromwell, how could they *who separated themselves* carry with them the rights of their brethren, when not only had they no delegation for such a purpose, but were disavowed or condemned by those in whom even the temporal rights as yet were vested. Should there be a secession of some half-dozen Members of the City of Dublin Corporation, from that august body, who should unite with the Catholic Association, could they carry along with them, the rights and privileges of the City, from the faithful phalanx which remained behind unbroken?

The Legislature might, indeed, transfer such rights and privileges even to the Association, did it seem so meet, and

the latter would in that case be as legal possessors of them as those who now enjoy them ; but they would be so, not in consequence of the few deserters who seceded, but in virtue of the act which disfranchised the one body, and instituted the other in their room. Just so it happened when the *Establishment* was transferred. The secession of a few Irish Bishops had no more effect on that transfer, than the defection of the entire body, had it occurred, would have had upon the Catholicity of the Church.

This character of the Church does not belong to the Church of any nation, unless inasmuch as she is an integral part of the Church of *all nations*, which alone is properly called Catholic.

The Catholic Church of Ireland, or of England, or of France, signifies only that portion of the Universal Church which is found in these countries respectively, and should they, or any one of them or any portion of one of them *separate itself* from the HEAD, which is the centre of unity and bond of connexion to the entire, it ceases from that moment to belong to the Catholic Church ! It is a branch which has been broken or lopped off—A tower that has fallen from the mighty edifice which Christ has constructed on the earth.

These unkind deserters, therefore, of whom Declan speaks, could not carry with them either a title to temporalities against the will of the Corporation to which they belonged, though such title might afterwards be given to them by the State, and still less could they convey spiritual jurisdiction or the character of Catholicity or Apostolicity from the Church which discarded or anathematized them, and which never has re-admitted them to her communion, or to a participation of those rights, which having received from above, are not, like establishments, subject to the controul of Princes.

“The adventurers who came here to watch the baggage “and collect the spoils,” “the holy Harpies” of whom J. K. L. made such irreverent mention, are not these men, but that scrofula of the Church of England, who came here chiefly during the reigns of Elizabeth and after Crom-

well; and of whom a Chief Secretary to one of the then Lord Lieutenants writes as follows:

“Whatever disorders are in the Church of England may
 “be seen in that of Ireland, and much more; namely gross
 “simony, greedy covetousness, fleshly incontinency, careless
 “sloth, and generally all disordered life in the common
 “clergymen. And besides these they have particular enor-
 “mities; they neither read the Scriptures nor preach to the
 “people, only they take the tithes and offerings, and ga-
 “ther what fruit they can off their livings, which they con-
 “vert as badly.” This writer proceeds to describe the holy
 harpies with singular *naivete*—“Yea, and some of the
 “Bishops, whose Dioceses are somewhat out of the world’s
 “eye, do not bestow the benefice upon any, but keep them
 “in their own hands, and set their servants or horseboys
 “to take up the fruits of them, with which some of them
 “purchase great lands, and build fair castles upon the
 “same.” Thus Spencer spoke of them in his “State of
 “Ireland.” Hume himself, his falsehoods and prejudices
 notwithstanding, gives of them an account not much more
 edifying!

It is true that previous to the reign of Henry, many English-
 men were established in Sees and Monasteries in this country,
 some of whom, like Gerald Barry, (the name is ominous,) served more to calumniate than to improve the Irish, whilst others were men of distinguished merit and exalted virtue. But I should prefer to form my judgment of the benefits mentioned by Declan as conferred on this country by English ecclesiastics, from public documents such as the proceedings of a Synod held in Dublin quoted by Ware, than from the interested pleadings of any advocate. In that Synod the English Clergy were upbraided in full meeting, with having introduced *vices thereto unknown* in the Irish Church.

But why are these disclosures forced from us by a false brother who, more intent on vilifying and misrepresenting the Church he has deserted, than in elucidating truth, has had the effrontery to state “that in the 16th century in
 “Ireland, religion wanted to be humanized: that her
 “abuses were of such a nature and so inveterate in the

“ national habits that they could not have been reclaimed even to the popery of a civilized kingdom.”

Were I to retort, and exhibit, not from my own fancy, but from the page of history or modern times the abuses, and scandals of what is called a reformation, I might wound the feelings of many worthy men, but would not advance the interests of peace. These retorts are indeed sometimes wrung even from our reluctance, lest crimes and folly should seem to be the fruit of our Creed which always condemns them, and not the natural growth of the depraved nature of man—greater or less in proportion as religious and social institutions restrain their passions or warrant their indulgence. On this subject it might be useful to Declan and his fellow labourers to attend to the poet’s salutary admonition, *discite justitiam moniti.*”

Unwilling to obtrude on the public observations which regard myself more than my subject, I omit all justification of my definition of law, as quoted by Declan, as well as all notice of the insinuations conveyed in his remarks on it. My profession has obliged me to devote more time to such studies than was required of Declan. A scholar acquainted with law would never have censured my definition. This writer must have misunderstood it, as no man of integrity would knowingly misrepresent it as he has done. I dismiss his laboured apology—and unless his future productions should exceed his essay on the rights of the Church, they will not disturb “ the repose of my retreat, nor employ any portion of my leisure.” It was an anxiety to defend my own principles, and those of my Catholic Brethren which induced me to notice what I should not otherwise have rescued from obscurity.

J. K. L.

APPENDIX.

NOTE A.

MAN is connected with the external world by a centre of sensation and motion, from which certain prolongations emanate to every part of the body, and are destined to apprise their common centre of the influence of external bodies when applied to their respective organs. This centre of sensation is the brain, in which the mind of man is said to reside; and its prolongations are whitish pulpy chords composed of bundles or fasiculi or fibres called nerves. These arise from the brain or spinal marrow, and terminate in the different organs and structures of the body, causing sensation and feeling in every part. Thus, if a foreign body be applied to any part of the human fabric, it produces a certain change or feeling in such part, which is conveyed in an unknown manner to the brain by means of the nerves of such part; and sensation is produced. If we interrupt by compression of the nerves, the communication between the organs and the brain, all consciousness of impressions of objects, and all sensation will be suspended. Thus the violent pain of whitlow will cease, if we bind the arm so tightly as to compress the nerves which convey sensation to the brain. The application of a tourniquet on the leg, before amputation, so compresses the nerves of the limb, as, almost, to deprive them of sensation and render the part incapable of motion. All causes then which impede or interrupt the influx of nervous power into the muscles or other organs of the body will deprive them of sensation and motion, and are called the causes of palsy. These are compression, obstruction or lesion of the brain, affusion of blood, serum, or purulent matter on its substance, and different kinds of tumours, all or any of which may cause this complaint. Pressure on the origins of the nerves in the brain, or on some part of them, as they pass to their respective determinations, induced by an increased quantity of blood in the head, is the immediate cause of palsy. Such tendency of blood to the head usually happens to persons with large heads, short necks—malformations which impede the return of blood from the head, and cause it to be accumulated in the brain, which, if suddenly induced, causes that general palsy called apoplexy. The School of Medicine in Edinburgh, justly acknowledged the first in Europe, inculcates that, "Apoplexy is generally preceded by various symptoms, such as frequent fits of giddiness, frequent head-aches, bleeding from the nose, some transitory interruptions of seeing and hearing, some transitory degree of numbness or loss of motion in the extremities; some faltering of the tongue in speaking, a loss of memory, frequent drowsiness, and frequent fits of night-mare." (1) The termination of apoplexy is most unfavourable, for it usually ends in palsy, of one or both sides, which become deprived of feeling and motion, and flabby, decayed, and useless to the individual. The immortal Hippocrates, the father and founder of physic, who flourished 460 years before the æra of our man's redemption, remarked, that "if any part of the body were deprived of motion, it cannot be restored to health." The incurable nature of palsy was observed long before his time by the Jews, as we read in the sacred Scriptures, and hence the sudden cure of it was always deemed miraculous. Celsus, a physician of note, in the commencement of the first century, remarks, "that if any member of the body be relaxed, and if it cannot be moved but wastes, it will not return to its primitive form, especially if of long duration, and hence old persons are mostly emaciated." (2) There can be no doubt as to the accuracy of these observations, for if the body be deprived of motion and exercise for any considerable time, loss of appetite and want of tone in all the organs, will so impair the process of digestion, as to prevent the preparation of a sufficient supply as nutriment in the proportion necessary for health. Hence diminution of the body (the blood being continually expended in sustaining the size and functions of the several organs, without an adequate supply of food for the decrease,) emaciation and complete loss of bodily power will ensue. Under such circumstances, it is obvious that the body and its functions

(1) Cullen's Pract. Med. v. 2, p. 67. The text book of the University of Edinburgh.—Also Cheyne on Apoplexy, 1812. The Naturalist of Dublin.

(2) Celsus, B. 2, c. viii.

will soon be greatly impaired, and ultimately almost unfit for the preservation of life. Such is the opinion of the Medical Schools on this subject at this day.

Let us now consider the opinions of Physicians since those early times down to the present, as to the usual and most frequent termination of palsy and, I take liberty to remark, that in all the following references, I enumerate the opinions of the most famous authorities of their times.

Palsy may be perfect as when all sense and motion are abolished, as in Apoplexy or partial when certain parts only are affected. "If atrophy or great extenuation or wasting of the paralysed parts come on, and great palidity, the hope of cure is lost." (3) "Palsy is generally long protracted and cured with difficulty, but on of the violent kind admits of no cure at all," (4) "if there be atrophy and emaciation of the paralysed parts with palidity, every hope of cure is in vain." (5) "Palsy is difficult of cure and often accompanies the patient to his grave." (6) "If there be coldness, insensibility and wasting of the parts, palsy is seldom curable." (7) "Palsy is often long continued, and almost incurable in aged persons." (8) "When sense and motion are destroyed in the palsied parts, the indication of cure is unfavourable, and, indeed, seldom happens, (9) "Paralysis accompanied with atrophy, emaciation and frigidity is deemed incurable." (10) The celebrated De Hean, of Vienna, writes on the irremediable nature of palsy when long continued, (11) and also the famous Stoerck, who said "if the parts were cold and emaciated, palsy was cured with difficulty and tediousness, and often incurable," (12) "Palsy is a dangerous disease when it arises in consequence of apoplexy, it generally proves very difficult of cure." (13) "The patient drags the paralytic limb by great exertion continues long, perhaps for years, in this condition, is often confined to bed in a most helpless state for several weeks, and then dies gradually exhausted, sometimes in a comatose day or two before death." (14) The last and best work on Palsy is published by Dr. Cooke, in 1821, and with regard to the subject of termination, he states "the prognosis in the general palsies must be always unfavourable." (15) I shall now beg the reader's attention to the certificate of Dr. Mills as to the paralytic state of Mrs. Stewart, of Ranelagh Convent, as the first, most scientific, and honest account of her disease. This gentleman attended her for three years, and states "that her complaint was generally of an apoplectic tendency, the attacks frequently sometimes followed by paralysis of the upper and lower extremities, the sight occasionally impaired, blindness once occurred, the voice became faint, and, within the last two years, the powers of articulation were lost for many hours, for two or more days, which symptoms were removed by the approved remedies, and issues were placed in the crown of the head, nape of the neck, and left arm. The digestive organs were frequently disturbed, and as frequently restored to their healthy actions. For the last ten months her health declined, and for the last half-year she was confined to bed from the weakness of her lower extremities. In June last her voice became faint, and, in the middle of July, she had been three weeks without speaking, and on the 31st of July replied to my questions by signs, and on the first of August walked forth to receive me in her usual manner.—Signed, Thomas Mills, M. D." Was there ever a better description of a tendency to apoplexy than this? Yet, hear the tale of the accommodating Dr. Cheyne, who states, "that in June last she was emaciated and exhausted," this he saw, "and he was told she laboured under a determination of blood to her head;" a fact, it appears, he did not learn from her symptoms, "but she had various nervous symptoms of an anomalous kind," the term anomalous is applied when the symptoms of a disease cannot be ascribed to any

(3) Hollerus op. Med. 1635, p. 68.

(4) Lommius op. Med. 1560, p. 60.

(5) Riverius Prax. Med. 1672, fol. p. 14.

(6) Hciffman op. Med. 1718.

(7) Boerhaave, Prax. Med. 1708.

(8) Mead's Med. Precepts, 1758, p. 82.

(9) Van Sweitan, 4to. v. 3, p. 369.

(10) Lieutand Prax. Med. 1759, p. 139.

(11) De Hean Pract. Med. 1761, v. 1. p. 335,

(12) Stoerck, Precep. 1771, v. 1. p. 337.

(13) Thomas' Pract. Med. 1819.

(14) Abercrombie on Palsy, 1819—Ed. Med. and Surg. Journal.

(15) Cooke on the different kinds of Palsy.—Lon. 1821.

certain species, but the application of which, in this instance, was incorrect and unprofessional, and clearly implied that the opinion of Dr. Mills, as to the apoplectic tendency, was untrue, though it must be acknowledged as authentic by the youngest tyro in the profession, and is borne out by the fact, that all the symptoms yielded to the remedies applied.

The anomalous symptoms were "temporary loss of vision, speech, and muscular power," the most frequent precursors of an apoplectic tendency, and *described* and *admitted* as such in Dr. Cheyne's own little essay on apoplexy, above alluded to. Now, it appears, from the above certificates, and sworn testimony of respectable persons, that Mrs. Stewart had laboured under an apoplectic tendency, and long continued paralytic disorder, by which she was confined to bed for better than six months, and, on the 31st July, was speechless, and declared to be dying by her physicians, yet, contrary to the opinions of the most eminent men of the different periods above quoted, she declares herself *suddenly* free from palsy on the following day, August 1st, enjoying the power of motion and all her lost faculties. Limited, indeed, must the understanding of the man be, and unacquainted with the laws and operations of nature, who could suppose that, in one short day, such abolition of bodily power could be restored, and that such pristine vigour and strength could be established as to fit the body for the exertion of the many functions which health required. And, is it possible, that a regularly educated physician could entertain, much less avow, so absonous and unmedical an opinion? Yet we have witnessed it, nay from the man who has written otherwise on the subject. Without fear of refutation, I challenge the faculty of physicians in any country, to produce unimpeachable medical evidence of the sudden cure of paralysis of so long duration, as in the cases of Mrs. Stewart, Miss Dowell, or Miss Lalor. No, there is not one such case to be found from among the many thousands on medical record. As to cases made up in pamphlets since the restoration of these ladies, and fabricated for the occasion, they are of no value, therefore the cures of the cases under consideration differ from all the ordinary cures on record, and were effected by means different from the usual course of nature, or what men call natural principles.

It is really a curious consideration how, at a certain hour, appointed at the distance of many hundred miles, and on a future day, at least one month distant, that these three incurable cases should be suddenly restored to health contrary to the humanly appointed fixed principles of nature. But this has been ascribed to the force of imagination. Ridiculous assertion! can man suddenly renew such destruction of bodily power by the force of imagination? Can he remove the most trivial complaint to which he is liable by thought? If he can, how comes disease? Imperfect, indeed, would the human body be, if we could remodel and metamorphose it at pleasure. But the idea is an outrage on common sense. Moreover, the excitement which would be induced by the slightest hope, would only increase the determination of blood to the head, and continue the palsy; and indeed each of the ladies whose cases we are considering, were desponding when the cure happened. With respect to Miss Dowell's case, the late Dr. Baillie, whose reputation as a scientific physician, justly elevated him to the first place in the city of London, Sir Henry Hallford, Drs. Mills, P. Crampton and Cheyne, pronounced her incurable. Is it likely that each and all of these physicians had mistaken so obvious a disease? Impossible, we have the testimony of several respectable persons, that Mr. Smith, the Surgeon at Mountrath, declared Miss Lalor to be incurable, and at a subsequent period, that her cure was miraculous. I have thus endeavoured to explain the medical part of these observations in as plain and simple a manner as possible, and, without vanity, I defy the Medical world, to impeach or contradict it.

NOTE B.

The attempts to explain on physical principles the cures in question is not unhappily ridiculed in the following letter extracted from the *Dublin Evening Post*.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE DUBLIN EVENING POST.

"SIR—I have read the Surgeon-General's Pamphlet, purporting to be 'An attempt to explain, on natural principles, the cures of Miss Lalor and Mrs. Stuart.' The Author asserts, that it is beyond all doubt, that the cure of *any* curable disease, may be as certainly performed by moral as by physical agency. (See page 8.) Now,

although I heard men of sound judgment give it as their opinion, that this Pamphlet was but

‘————— a fine sample on the whole,
‘ Of reasoning, which the learned call rigmazole.’

Yet, I cannot but consider *that* one of the greatest discoveries of modern times, which renders unnecessary the exhibition of a vile farrago of nauseous medicines, which, in some cases, cure a local disease, but destroy the constitution; which are liable to be adulterated, or carelessly made up; which take sometimes a long while to produce their salutary effects, often requiring an application of hot towels to moderate their activity; and withal, which cost a great deal of money; not to mention the horror of a Patient’s mind, who dreads he has taken Oxalic Acid for Epsom Salts, Laudanum for Daffy’s Elixir, &c. &c.

“I am not one, Sir, who would deprive any man of a scintilla of his merits, so, while I allow myself the liberty of diffusing this new light to my Country, I will be ingenious enough to own, that the Author of the above-mentioned Pamphlet is the original inventor or discoverer of the moral treatment of physical disease.

“For the sake of ‘suffering humanity,’ I entreat you to announce, that it is my intention, as soon as I have completed my arrangements, to deliver a Course of Lectures on Phantasi-akesiology or the Prophylactic and Therapeutic treatment of ALL diseases through the imagination, particularly disorganized liver, tuberculated lungs, or a flaccid and *extenuated* heart,* which the learned Author sets down as being particularly caused by a diseased imagination, and which, as all his reasoning tends to prove, should consequently be most easily cured *through* the imagination. On Doctor Cheyne’s authority, *I have no doubt* of being eminently successful in cases where the symptoms are multiform and anomalous, their exacerbations violent, and of long duration, where they have completely prostrated the Patient’s strength, and animal and organic powers and sensibilities, setting at naught the skill of three or four of the first Physicians of the land, and all the medicines and applications in their Pharmacopæia. I have, I say, no doubt of being able to cure such a case in *ten minutes*, although aggravated by the exhaustion which the Patient may have suffered by running the gauntlet through issues, blisters, cupping, general bleeding, cathartics, emetics, diaphoretic *et omne medicamen quod exit in etics!* I shall take the liberty of sending you a Prospectus of my Lectures in a few days, and of a Dispensatory, which I am compiling to assist the Practitioners in my system. I beg leave to acknowledge the valuable assistance I received in this Compilation from Dr. Jacob’s new edition of ‘Zimmerman’s Story-Book,’ as also the prefatory remarks by the Doctor himself, which explains, in a new and instructive manner, the nature of joy, grief, and fear, illustrated by stories of ‘Mental Emotion,’ producing crying, sneezing, sympathetic yawning, blushing, laughing, vomiting, sleeping, teeth-watering, and teeth-on-edging. (which last he acknowledges he was near forgetting;) and a new and learned view of their proximate causes, viz.: bad news and onions, snuff, gaping pictures, words, glances and signs, tickling and funny stories, sheriff’s officers and tartar emetic, baby’s hushabies, music, stupid essays and opium, savory dishes, cutting corks, grinding knives and sharpening saws, with a borrowed hint on the probable effects of a tune on the bagpipes.

“I am, Sir, your obedient Servant,

“BOERHAAVE, Jun.”

* See the above-mentioned Pamphlet, pages 6 and 7.

NOTE C.

Miss Mather’s own account of the mode in which her cure was effected, is so interesting, that I willingly rescue it from the ephemeral columns of a newspaper. The letter is addressed to an Irish Catholic Clergyman.

“London, the 17th of July, 1823.

“REVEREND FATHER,—It is with the greatest pleasure, that in compliance with your request, I give you in writing the particulars of my long and severe illness, and of the wonderful cure which the Almighty, in his unbounded mercy, has been pleased to work in favour of the most unworthy of his servants. I was taken ill on the 15th March, 1822, with an Inflammation in the Stomach; the progress of the malady, rapidly increasing, soon alarmed the Physicians, who declared me to be in imminent danger. However through medical assistance and the blessing of God, I recovered so far, as to be able to sit up for eight or ten hours, and was declared in a state of convalescence. I had been going on better and better for a few days, when on a sudden, I was taken with a most violent pain in the stomach, and was obliged to be carried

into bed, where I remained for the space of fifteen months, labouring under the most excruciating pain, and ever since, till the day of my cure, was taken three or four times a day with spasms in the stomach. Every attempt to leave my bed, produced the most violent pain in the stomach, and after the attempt I would lie for several hours, suffering under acute hysterical flatulency, and violent head ache. In short, my agony was extreme, and I became completely bed ridden—My stomach was reduced to such a degree of weakness, that the lightest food taken in the smallest quantity, could not digest without pain, and I could take nothing, except in a lying posture; I was constantly bedewed with clammy perspiration. Two months previous to my cure, the pains in my stomach much increased and brought on a cough, which was so severe, that I coughed sometimes for three hours together. Under these numerous infirmities, I was attended by the most eminent Physicians in London. They soon lost all hopes of my recovery and could do nothing more for me. In so deplorable a situation, I turned my eyes towards Heaven, and looked to God alone for a cure, which I could not obtain, through the ordinary means appointed by his Providence. My friends having heard of the wonderful cures, which the Almighty had been pleased to work through the Ministry of his Serene Highness, Prince Alexander of Hohenlohe, addressed a letter to him, on the 3d of April, 1823; stating the melancholy situation in which I was placed, and begged of him to intercede in my behalf at the Throne of Mercy. His Serene Highness favoured us with a polite and kind answer, informing us, that on the 13th of June, he would offer up for me, the most Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, and desired me to join with him in spirit at nine o'clock, after having confessed, and received the Holy Communion. In compliance with His Serene Highness's directions, on the appointed day I made my confession, and received the Blessed Sacrament at a little after twelve o'clock in the morning, (for I could not abstain from drink.) At nine o'clock, the Reverend Mr. Silveira offered up for the same intention the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, at which all the family assisted with sentiments of the greatest confidence, and at the same time of perfect resignation to the will of God. For my part I united myself in spirit to the Mass, which his Serene Highness was then offering up for me; and as I was reading the prayers of the ordinary of the Mass, when I had proceeded as far as the Elevation, I tried to kneel on the bed, but could not continue for an instant. After having finished them, I repeated the same trial, but found it equally vain. Then I formed the acts of Faith, Hope, and Charity, of Contrition and of perfect resignation to the will of God. This done, I felt a complete change in all my body, and found myself quite free from pain; for the third time, I tried to kneel on the bed, and finding myself strong and free from pain, I proceeded to get up on the bed, finding this succeed, I jumped out of bed and walked without the least pain. After having returned thanks upon my knees to the giver of all good gifts, I took my breakfast sitting up, wrote a letter with a firm hand, and did not go to bed before eight o'clock in the evening, so that I sat up ten hours, without having the least pain, oppression, or coughing. All my family were in the greatest astonishment and admiration, they wept for joy and could not believe what they saw, expecting every moment to see the return of the violent pains with which I was usually afflicted, and unceasingly enquiring if I had no pain. In a word, the change was so great that I myself could scarce believe it, it appeared to me as if I were in another body. A little after I had got up, I received the visit of the Reverend Mr. Silveira, who more than astonished could not speak a word, but fell on his knees, and recited the *te Deum* with us. I was also visited on the same day by the Reverend Mr. Law, who was equally struck with astonishment. Since that happy day I am entirely free from my severe malady, and I had the happiness to return to Chapel for the first time on the 2d instant, the Feast of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary. Reverend Sir, this is the true and faithful narrative of my long illness and wonderful cure; may this miraculous event, prove to the greater honor and glory of him who worked it, may it serve to fortify the faithful in their belief of the real presence of Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament, and the powerful efficacy of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, may it serve to enlighten our separated brethren, and may it turn to the benefit of my poor Soul, redeemed by the Blood of Christ. I hope that you will join with us in returning thanks to Almighty God, for so great and undeserved a favor, and that you will remember me in your pious prayers, and particularly when offering up the Holy Sacrifice. As you told me that you wished this narrative in writing to shew to your particular friends, I shall take the liberty to entreat those who shall read it, to unite with us in acts of thanksgiving, and to remember me in their pious prayers. I remain with sentiments of the highest veneration and most profound respect, Reverend Sir,

“Your most humble and obedient servant,

“CLARA MATHER.”



